

Decision PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ KAO (Mailed 4/7/2026)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U39E) for Review of the Disadvantaged Communities – Green Tariff, Community Solar Green Tariff and Green Tariff Shared Renewables Programs.

Application 22-05-022

And Related Matters.

Application 22-05-023

Application 22-05-024

DECISION IMPLEMENTING CALIFORNIA SHARED RENEWABLES PORTFOLIO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
DECISION IMPLEMENTING CALIFORNIA SHARED RENEWABLES PORTFOLIO.....	2
Summary	2
1. Background	2
1.1. Submission Date	7
2. Issues Before the Commission.....	7
3. Community Renewable Energy Tariff	7
3.1. ReMAT Modifications and Proposed New Tariffs.....	9
3.2. Community Renewable Energy Tariff Implementation	13
4. Green Tariff Implementation.....	16
4.1. Recovery of Stranded Legacy Green Tariff Costs.....	16
4.2. Program Oversight.....	19
4.3. Modified Green Tariff Implementation Timelines	20
5. DAC-GT Implementation	22
5.1. Program Funding	22
5.2. Program Evaluation	23
5.3. New DAC-GT Programs Administered by Community Choice Aggregators	23
6. Program Reporting for Modified DAC-GT, Modified Green Tariff, and Community Renewable Energy Program	24
7. Summary of Public Comment.....	26
8. Procedural Matters.....	27
9. Comments on Proposed Decision.....	27
10. Assignment of Proceeding.....	30
Findings of Fact.....	30
Conclusions of Law	32
O R D E R	34

DECISION IMPLEMENTING CALIFORNIA SHARED RENEWABLES PORTFOLIO

Summary

This decision adopts a process to implement the customer community renewable energy tariff adopted by Decision (D.) 24-05-065. Following the United States Environmental Protection Agency's August 2025 termination of California's Solar for All award and the resulting current lack of available external funding, this decision supersedes D.24-05-065 regarding a nonparticipating customer-funded adder.

This decision also addresses Green Tariff program oversight and cost recovery, Disadvantaged Communities-Green Tariff funding and program evaluation, and program reporting for California Shared Renewables Portfolio programs.

This proceeding is closed.

1. Background

In Decision (D.) 24-05-065, the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) evaluated Green Access Program tariff options, including Green Tariff Shared Renewables (GTSR), Disadvantaged Communities-Green Tariff (DAC-GT), and Community Solar Green Tariff (CSGT). D.24-04-065 established a new California Shared Renewables Portfolio, which consists of a modified Green Tariff, a modified DAC-GT, and a new community renewable energy program.¹ D.24-05-065 also established the framework for the new community renewable

¹ The Green Tariff Shared Renewables (GTSR) Program originally consisted of two components: the Green Tariff (GT) and the Enhanced Community Renewables (ECR). D.24-04-065 modified the Green Tariff and discontinued ECR.

energy program, with certain implementation details to be determined in a subsequent decision. These implementation details include all the requirements specified by Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code Section 769.3(c), including:

- Complement and align with the requirements of Section 10-115 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations);²
- Ensure at least 51 percent of the program’s capacity serves low-income customers;³
- Minimize impacts to nonparticipating customers by prohibiting the program’s costs from being paid by nonparticipating customers in excess of the avoided costs;⁴
- Construction of facilities participating in the program must comply with specified prevailing wage requirements;⁵
- Provide bill credits to subscribers based on the avoided costs of the program’s facilities;⁶ and
- Prioritize the maximum use of state and federal incentives and accelerate implementation of the program to ensure that time- or quantity-limited federal incentives can be obtained for the benefit of subscribers.⁷

² Pub. Util. Code §769.3(c)(1); D.24-05-065 at 112, 21-123.

³ Pub. Util. Code §769.3(c)(2); D.24-05-065 at 118-119, 123-124.

⁴ Pub. Util. Code §769.3(c)(3) (specifying that “[q]ualifying funds for financial incentives shall only be available through an appropriation by the Legislature.”); D.24-05-065 at 124.

⁵ Pub. Util. Code §769.3(c)(4); D.24-05-065 at 124-125.

⁶ Pub. Util. Code §769.3(c)(5) (specifying “as determined by the commission’s methods for calculating the full set of benefits of distributed energy resources. The commission may use actual wholesale market prices for the energy supply portion of an avoided cost calculation or credit value.”); D.24-05-065 at 125.

⁷ Pub. Util. Code §769.3(c)(6) (specifying “[a]s part of this prioritization, the commission shall ensure that a community renewable energy facility participating in the community renewable

Footnote continued on next page.

Importantly, with respect to prohibiting the program's costs from being paid by nonparticipating customers in excess of the avoided costs, D.24-05-065 concluded that the Commission should use the utilities' current Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA) compliant tariffs as a foundation.⁸

With respect to state and federal incentives, D.24-05-065 referred to potential grant funding from the federal Inflation Reduction Act and the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA) Solar for All competition, among other external funding sources.⁹ D.24-05-065 also concluded it would be reasonable to use \$33 million appropriated from the state's General Fund to the Commission for the community renewable energy program.¹⁰

D.24-05-065 also replaced existing reporting requirements for the Green Access Programs with a requirement to quarterly post program metrics to the California Distributed Generation Statistics (DGStats) website.¹¹

On June 5, 2024, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling inviting parties to comment on the implementation of D.24-05-065, including the new community renewable energy program (June 5, 2024 Ruling).

energy program is eligible for an enhanced federal investment tax credit available as a qualified low-income economic benefit project pursuant to subsection (e) of Section 48 of Title 26 of the United States Code.”); D.24-05-065 at 118, 125-126.

⁸ D.24-05-065 at 111-116, Findings of Fact (FoF) 49, 58, 60, Conclusions of Law (CoL) 9, 15, 16, 17, 18.

⁹ D.24-05-065 at 125-126, FoF 61, COL 10.

¹⁰ D.24-05-065 at 118, COL 50.

¹¹ D.24-05-065 at 130-131, Ordering Paragraphs (OP) 6, 7, 8.

On April 1, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling providing notice that U.S. EPA guidance regarding California's Solar for All award requires a five-year "period of performance," including a hard deadline for spending (not encumbering) funds (April 1, 2025 Ruling). The April 1, 2025 Ruling further noted that California's Solar for All Work Plan includes a number of U.S. EPA requirements, including Build America, Buy America Act standards, and Davis Bacon and Related Acts requirements. The April 1, 2025 Ruling sought comment on whether these new requirements altered parties' earlier recommendations.

Remote Solar Advocates; California Tribal Energy Collective, Inc. (CTEC); Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA); Clean Energy Alliance, Silicon Valley Clean Energy, Peninsula Clean Energy Authority, San Diego Community Power, City and County of San Francisco, Clean Power Alliance of Southern California, San Jose Clean Energy (collectively, Joint CCAs and CCSF); Southern California Edison Company (SCE); Dimension Energy, LLC (Dimension Energy); GRID Alternatives; San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E); San Diego Community Power and Clean Energy Alliance (jointly); Coalition for Community Solar Access (CCSA); Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA); Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E); Solar Landscape Origination LLC; Clean Power Alliance of Southern California (CPA); the Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission; and Foundation Windpower, LLC (Foundation Windpower) timely filed comments. Dimension Energy, CCSA, Foundation Windpower, SDG&E, SBUA, GRID Alternatives, PG&E, CTEC, SEIA, Joint CCAs and CCSF, and SCE timely filed reply comments. This decision addresses party comments as they relate to the determinations we reach.

On June 27, 2025, California's 2025-2026 Budget Bill was enacted. As part of the budget, \$33 million previously appropriated to the Commission, for community renewable energy program usage and storage-backed renewable generation programs, reverted to the General Fund.¹²

On July 4, 2025, the federal government enacted Public Law 119-21. Public Law 119-21 significantly modifies, and in some instances repeals, various renewable energy provisions that were enacted as part of the Inflation Reduction Act. Most notably, Public Law 119-21 accelerates the expiration of federal tax credits to the end of 2025 for residential projects and 2027 for commercial projects.¹³

On August 7, 2025, the U.S. EPA Office of Mission Support sent a letter to the Commission's Energy Division providing notice that the U.S. EPA was terminating California's Solar for All award. The State of California and the

¹² Assembly Bill 102 (Stats. 2025, Ch. 5) Sec. 227.

¹³ Public Law 119-21 (Title VII, Subtitle A, Chapter 5), *accessible at* <https://www.congress.gov/119/plaws/publ21/PLAW-119publ21.pdf> (last accessed January 8, 2026).

The Inflation Reduction Act introduced technology-neutral production (45Y) and investment (48E) tax credits for clean electricity generation, effective starting in 2025 and scheduled to last through at least 2032. For solar and wind electricity, the credit ends for any facilities placed in service after December 31, 2027. However, facilities that begin construction within 12 months of the law's enactment are exempt from this deadline. The credits can no longer be transferred to specified foreign entities or foreign influenced entities beginning in the taxable year following the enactment of the law on July 4, 2025.

Commission have challenged the U.S. EPA's termination as unlawful. That litigation remains ongoing.¹⁴

On January 27, 2026, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling providing an opportunity to comment on the propriety of taking official notice of the U.S. EPA letter (January 27, 2026 Ruling). No party filed a pleading on the propriety of taking official notice or the tenor of the matter to be noticed in response to the ruling. This decision takes official notice of the U.S. EPA letter.¹⁵

1.1. Submission Date

This matter was submitted on February 6, 2026, upon the passing of the final date to file comments in response to the January 27, 2026 Ruling.

2. Issues Before the Commission

This decision addresses implementation issues for the California Shared Renewables Portfolio in accordance with D.24-05-065, including a new Community Renewable Energy tariff, the modified Green Tariff, DAC-GT, and program reporting.

3. Community Renewable Energy Tariff

As of the submission date of this matter, no specific funds from nonparticipating customer sources identified by D.24-05-065 are available. Notwithstanding the lack of available funds to incentivize projects and program participation, this decision finalizes implementation details of the Community

¹⁴ The State of California and the Commission have challenged the U.S. EPA's purported termination of California's Solar for All grant as unlawful. That litigation is ongoing. There is no current definitive timeline for when the litigation will be resolved.

¹⁵ *Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Superseding January 16, 2026 Ruling Providing Notice and Opportunity on Taking Official Notice*, issued January 27, 2026.

Renewable Energy tariff that complies with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c), in accordance with D.24-05-065. In the event that available external funding is identified, this decision provides direction to the utilities for implementation of the new community renewable energy program.

In accordance with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c) and D.24-05-065, this decision determines that the Renewable Market Adjusting Tariff (ReMAT) shall serve as a cost and generation resource foundation for the new Community Renewable Energy tariff. Although D.24-05-065 states that either a PURPA Standard Offer Contract or ReMAT may be used, it is reasonable to select ReMAT. Contracts under ReMAT may be initiated for up to 20 years of deliveries, while the PURPA Standard Offer Contract only permits a 12-year maximum contract length for new facilities.¹⁶ Thus, resources that generate energy for the Community Renewable Energy tariff must meet ReMAT program eligibility and criteria, as established in the ReMAT tariff, and execute new ReMAT power purchase agreements (PPAs), so that the load serving entity receiving the energy may count the associated renewable energy credits (REC) towards its Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) requirements. Further, the executed ReMAT PPAs will count towards the investor-owned utility's (IOU) ReMAT program cap.

Several parties, in comments to the June 5, 2024 and April 1, 2025 Rulings, advocated for a community renewable energy program tariff that would provide compensation in excess of PURPA avoided costs. As determined in D.24-05-065

¹⁶ D.24-05-065 at 115-117; *see also* PG&E Reply Comments to June 5, 2024 Ruling at 6.

and further discussed here, providing compensation in excess of PURPA avoided costs would not comply with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c).¹⁷

3.1. ReMAT Modifications and Proposed New Tariffs

Several parties argue for either modifying PURPA-compliant tariffs, such as ReMAT, or creating a new tariff. In addition, parties propose additional ratepayer-funded compensation based on a combination of capacity, transmission, distribution, and/or other anticipated benefits.

Joint CCAs and CCSF propose to offer a “Community Solar Adder,” which they describe as contributing to the overall PPA price paid to the developer, and a “Grid Capacity Adder” to projects in capacity constrained areas. Joint CCAs and CCSF also propose a maximum project size of five megawatts (MW), which is higher than the three MW maximum project size permitted under ReMAT.¹⁸

Dimension Energy asserts that ReMAT program elements, including maximum project size, statewide program size cap, and As-Available Peaking category availability, pose procedural barriers. Dimension Energy further argues that the Commission must establish a new tariff, based on ReMAT, but include time of delivery differentials and a higher project size cap.¹⁹

¹⁷ Pub. Util. Code §769.3(c) (“The community renewable energy program, if established, shall...[m]inimize impacts to nonparticipating customers by prohibiting the program’s costs from being paid by nonparticipating customers in excess of the avoided costs. Qualifying funds for financial incentives shall only be available through an appropriation by the Legislature.”).

¹⁸ Joint CCAs and CCSF Opening Comments on June 5, 2024 Ruling at 6, 11-14. Joint CCAs and CCSF also propose a “Community Goals Adder,” which they state would be paid by the participating CCA.

¹⁹ Dimension Energy Opening Comments on June 5, 2024 Ruling at 11-14; Dimension Energy Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 5.

Similarly, SEIA recommends using a ReMAT PPA with a 20-year term. However, SEIA asserts that the ReMAT should include updates to each IOU's Payment Allocation Factor, a ratepayer-funded "Capacity Adder" for solar-plus-storage projects, and a "Project Adder" for all projects, to cover any remaining developer costs for solar or solar-plus-storage projects plus non-low-income subscriber credits. SEIA also advocates for expanding the maximum project size to five MW.²⁰

CCSA also recommends a maximum project size of five MW, adjusting for time of delivery factors, and providing additional compensation for anticipated locational and transmission and distribution benefits.²¹

Similar to the proposed Net Value Billing Tariff addressed in D.24-05-065, many of the above recommendations would result in nonparticipant-funded compensation that exceeds avoided costs. Therefore, these recommendations fail to comply with Pub. Util. Code 769.3(c). As PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E explain with respect to the proposed Net Value Billing Tariff, other wholesale procurement mechanisms use least cost best fit criteria and result in lower

²⁰ SEIA Opening Comments on June 5, 2024 Ruling at 8-9; SEIA Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 7.

²¹ CCSA Opening Comments on June 5, 2024 Ruling at 12-23; CCSA Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 7. CCSA's assertion that "[t]he Commission also acknowledged that these foundational tariffs must be modified to comply with the requirements of AB 2316 and Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3," citing to D.24-05-065 at 148, misinterprets D.24-05-065. D.24-05-065's OP 10 directed the IOUs to each submit a Tier 1 advice letter proposing any additional supply-side tariffs applicable for the community renewable energy program; the investor-owned utilities timely submitted those advice letters (PG&E AL 7339-E, SCE AL 4343-E, and SDG&E AL 4485-E) and did not identify any other PURPA-compliant tariffs. The advice letters did not receive comments or protests identifying any omitted or alternative tariffs.

contracted prices. This means nonparticipating customers would pay more for power from community renewable energy program generators than from ReMAT and other renewable generators, even though these generators share the same traits.²² Further, such a tariff would divert developers away from the IOUs' competitive solicitations, compounding the cost impact by driving up the cost of renewable power for all ratepayers.²³

This decision declines to adopt party recommendations that would not comply with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3, and that would contravene the findings reached in D.24-05-065. D.24-05-065 concluded that the Commission is unable to determine whether a project would avoid any transmission or distribution costs for projects in the same service territory as subscribers, much less what those avoided costs would be.²⁴ D.24-05-065 also determined that, without the ability of utilities and community choice aggregators (CCAs) to claim Resource Adequacy credits, a project could not avoid generation capacity costs.²⁵

Other proposed modifications to the ReMAT tariff cannot be adopted. Adjustments to time of delivery factors would risk ratepayer-funded compensation in excess of PURPA avoided costs. Increasing the maximum project size to five MW and increasing the statewide program capacity cap

²² PG&E Opening Comments on June 23, 2023 Ruling at 11-12 and 15-16; SCE Opening Comments on June 23, 2023 Ruling at 19-24; SDG&E Opening Comments on June 23, 2023 Ruling at 10; PG&E Reply Comments on June 23, 2023 Ruling at 7-8.

²³ SCE Reply Comments on June 23, 2023 Ruling at 28-29.

²⁴ D.24-05-065 at 92.

²⁵ D.24-05-065 at 94-95.

would require legislative changes. All of these recommendations, if adopted, would require modifications beyond the scope of this proceeding and would more broadly impact the Commission's RPS procurement policies.²⁶ Further, as PG&E notes, ReMAT already includes differentiation in contract price based on the timing of expected energy delivery of a project, including projects that utilize energy storage, through different product types.²⁷ With respect to assertions regarding limited category availability, D.21-12-032 provides that an IOU's remaining MW for multiple product categories may be combined via a Tier 2 advice letter.

With respect to proposals for establishing a new tariff, D.24-05-065 makes clear that the foundational tariff must be an existing tariff that complies with PURPA.²⁸ Notwithstanding this requirement, the elements of a new tariff must still comply with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3, which would not occur under CCSA's and Dimension Energy's proposals.²⁹

²⁶ PG&E Reply Comments on June 5, 2024 ruling at 5-6; SCE Reply Comments on June 5, 2024 ruling) at 5-6; *see also* D.19-02-007 at 27-28; D.21-12-032 at 24-25.

²⁷ PG&E Reply Comments on June 5, 2024 Ruling at 5-6.

²⁸ D.24-05-065's OP 10 directs the IOUs to each submit a Tier 1 advice letter proposing any additional supply-side tariffs applicable for the community renewable energy program; the IOUs timely submitted those advice letters (PG&E AL 7339-E, SCE AL 4343-E, and SDG&E Advice Letter 4485-E) and did not identify any other PURPA-compliant tariffs. The advice letters did not receive comments or protests identifying any omitted or alternative tariffs.

²⁹ SCE Reply Comments on June 5, 2024 Ruling at 5.

3.2. Community Renewable Energy Tariff Implementation

This section addresses implementation details for the new Community Renewable Energy tariff.

Within 60 days after the issue date of this decision, PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall each submit a Tier 2 advice letter outlining the details of their proposed customer Community Renewable Energy tariff. D.24-05-065 directs that the adopted community renewable energy program will use the current tariffs as a foundation and layer on a subscription model.³⁰ As determined by this decision, each IOU's ReMAT tariff will serve as the cost and generation resource foundation of their respective Community Renewable Energy tariff. It is our expectation that PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will meet and confer prior to this submission to ensure that their tariffs are as uniform and consistent as practicable.

Following the disposition of the Community Renewable Energy tariff, and in the event that an external funding source is identified, each IOU shall submit a Tier 3 advice letter detailing and specifying the type of external funds to be layered on top of the Community Renewable Energy ReMAT compensation rate, the external funding amount(s), and required Community Renewable Energy tariff modifications needed to align its community renewable energy program with any terms and conditions tied to the use of those external funds. Each IOU shall also propose establishment of a subaccount in its respective Community Renewable Energy Program Balancing Account to record and recover

³⁰ D.24-05-065 at 117-118.

community renewable energy program implementation, marketing, and administrative costs. Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c)(3), the community renewable energy program's costs shall not be paid by nonparticipating customers in excess of the avoided costs.

Each IOU's Tier 3 advice letter shall also include a program implementation plan, which must follow all the requirements of Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c) and as further specified in D.24-05-065 and this decision. For calculation of the low-income bill credit, this decision specifies that the IOUs shall confer on an agreed-upon methodology for determining the monthly average electricity usage of eligible low-income customers, in order to determine the number of low-income customers (based on a 51 percent share of project capacity) that would be automatically enrolled in a given project.³¹ The IOUs shall apply a minimum 20 percent credit or discount to the applicable ReMAT contract price (e.g., for as-available peaking products, 20 percent of \$67.99 per MWh or \$0.07 per kWh), and multiply this discounted rate to the monthly average electricity usage of eligible low-income customers to determine the flat monetary credit for eligible low-income customers. The IOUs shall propose a non-low-income bill credit, the amount of which would depend on the amount of external funding available for additional compensation of project developers and for program implementation, marketing and administrative costs. The non-

³¹ D.24-05-065 Ordering Paragraph 1; and CCSA Opening Comments on June 5, 2024 Ruling at 10-11.

low-income bill credit shall also be based on the facility's avoided costs, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c)(5).

Each IOU's implementation plan shall include draft marketing materials to potential participating customers for Commission staff review. The draft marketing materials shall include clear language indicating that the utility (not the participating customer) is assigned the Renewable Energy Credits (REC) of the generation procured through this program. Each IOU's implementation plan shall include outreach to small businesses to ensure eligible small businesses are aware of how to participate in the program, at minimum including engagement with the Commission's Small Business Program.

In the event that no developer has executed a ReMAT PPA for a new community renewable energy project within two years after the disposal date of their Tier 2 Community Renewable Energy tariff advice letters, each IOU may discontinue their community renewable energy program by submitting a Tier 1 advice letter.

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(b)(2)(B), CCAs and electric service providers (ESPs) that notified the Commission of their intent to participate in the program may begin participating at any time by notifying the Commission via a Tier 1 advice letter. To minimize impacts to nonparticipating customers, CCAs that participate in the program should align their tariffs with the ReMAT pricing and PPAs of the IOU in whose service territory they operate. A CCA or ESP may also end its participation in the program at any time by notifying the Commission via a Tier 1 advice letter.

In comments to the proposed decision, Joint CCAs and CCSF assert D.24-05-065 should not be understood to have established the community renewable energy program. Joint CCAs and CCSF further assert that Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(b)(2)(B) provides that any CCA or ESP may begin and end its participation at any time, whether or not they notified the Commission of their intent to participate. This decision is not persuaded that Joint CCAs and CCSF's assertions accurately reflect Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(b)(2)(B). However, we also acknowledge that Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(b)(2)(B) does not provide a means for new CCAs (i.e., CCAs that may form more than 180 days after D.24-05-065's issuance) to participate. Further, in light of the changed circumstances regarding availability of external funding, this decision finds it reasonable to provide that any CCA or ESP may begin and end its participation in the community renewable energy program at any time (as opposed to only those CCAs or ESPs that provided notice within 180 days of the establishment of the program) by submitting a Tier 1 advice letter.

4. Green Tariff Implementation

This section addresses implementation of the Green Tariff, including cost recovery of stranded legacy Green Tariff costs, program oversight, and the modified Green Tariff implementation timeline.

4.1. Recovery of Stranded Legacy Green Tariff Costs

The June 5, 2024 Ruling asked parties to document stranded Green Tariff legacy costs and explain what the cost recovery process should be and who would pay. SDG&E provided opening comments, and the San Diego CCAs provided opening and reply comments. Subsequently, SDG&E and the San

Diego CCAs addressed this issue in SDG&E's 2023 Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) compliance proceeding, A.24-06-001. In A.24-06-001, SDG&E proposed to recover stranded GTSR costs through an equal cents-per-kilowatt-hour (kWh) rate applied to all customer classes via the public purpose program surcharge.

The April 1, 2025 Ruling in this proceeding asked parties to comment on (1) whether SDG&E's proposal complies with Assembly Bill (AB) 2838 (Stats. 2022, Ch. 418); (2) whether SDG&E should quantify these stranded costs by customer class and collect such costs on a pro rata basis by customer class; and (3) if cost recovery is approved, what mechanism should be used to collect the funds from customers.

In comments to the April 1, 2025 Ruling, most parties emphasize that parties to SDG&E's 2023 ERRA compliance proceeding litigated the issue, and suggest that it is more efficient to address cost recovery for legacy and modified Green Tariff programs in each IOU's ERRA compliance proceeding.³² SDG&E reiterates that legacy Green Tariff costs should be recovered through an equal cents-per-kWh rate similar to San Diego Community Power's DAC-GT and CSGT programs.³³ PG&E, SCE, SBUA, and Dimension Energy generally agree that if a program closes before the full cost is recovered from participating customers, it is appropriate to recover outstanding costs from all ratepayers. SCE

³² San Diego CCAs Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 2-4; SDG&E Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 3; CPA Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 1-3; Joint CCAs and CCSF Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 8; SCE Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 9.

³³ SDG&E Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 3-4.

asserts, however, that for its Green Rate and Community Renewables programs, both of which have subscribing customers and waitlists, ongoing legacy Green Tariff program costs should be recovered from participating Green Tariff customers.³⁴ SBUA argues that the Commission should allocate stranded asset costs to customer classes based on the class's electricity utilization share, including unbundled customers, and then recover from individual customers in each class via a public purpose program per-kWh surcharge.³⁵ CPA acknowledges that "there are distinctive challenges in recovering costs for the Legacy Green Tariff program in the service territory of [SDG&E]," but agrees with SCE's assertion because it "ensures that the ongoing costs from the Legacy Green Tariff program are not passed on to non-participating customers."³⁶

Because recovery of stranded legacy Green Tariff costs, as it relates to SDG&E, is being addressed in SDG&E's 2023 ERRRA compliance proceeding, this decision refrains from reaching a determination on that specific issue. The circumstances of SDG&E's legacy Green Tariff program, wherein a large number of customers departed to a CCA and generated stranded costs that could not be recovered from participating customers, appears applicable only to SDG&E. However, we anticipate similar treatment of stranded Green Tariff costs should the same or very similar circumstances occur in PG&E's and SCE's territories.

³⁴ SCE Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 8-9.

³⁵ PG&E Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 9; Dimension Energy Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 6-7; SCE Reply Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 6; SBUA Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 1-3.

³⁶ CPA Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 2.

This decision also agrees with most parties' recommendation to address recovery of Green Tariff costs in each IOU's ERRRA compliance proceeding. The Commission will consider the merits of each IOU's cost recovery proposal in their respective ERRRA compliance proceedings, beginning with each IOU's next most feasible ERRRA compliance proceeding.

4.2. Program Oversight

The April 1, 2025 Ruling asked parties whether the Commission should continue the same level of oversight of the modified Green Tariff program, given that the program is voluntary and fully funded by participants, or if procurement oversight through IOU Procurement Review Group (PRG) meetings and cost oversight through ERRRA proceedings is sufficient.

SDG&E asserts that oversight through advice letters and reporting is sufficient. SDG&E does not oppose discontinuing the annual forum.³⁷ SCE states the Commission can reduce its level of regulatory oversight by eliminating or reducing regulatory submissions and forums/meetings in favor of PRG meetings and cost oversight through ERRRA proceedings. SCE recommends that the Commission authorize SCE to submit Tier 2 advice letters to seek approval to make program changes or to close the program or its account.³⁸ PG&E does not believe the annual forums and advisory board meetings contribute to the success of the program, and the PRG meetings and ERRRA proceedings have proven effective for program governance, oversight, and review of program costs. PG&E

³⁷ SDG&E Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 4.

³⁸ SCE Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 9-10.

further notes that it expects reporting on the status of GTSR in its annual RPS procurement plan to continue upon implementation of the modified Green Tariff, and program metrics will be reported on the DGStats website.³⁹ CPA agrees that cost oversight of the legacy and modified Green Tariff programs should occur in the annual ERRA proceedings, not advice letters.⁴⁰

This decision finds that, because the modified Green Tariff program is voluntary and fully funded by participants, procurement oversight via PRG meetings and cost oversight via ERRA proceedings is sufficient. This decision discontinues all other required submittals as well as the annual forums and advisory board meetings ordered by D.15-01-051 and modified by Resolutions E-4734 and E-5028, D.16-05-006, D.17-07-007, D.21-12-036, and D.24-05-065.

4.3. Modified Green Tariff Implementation Timelines

On August 20, 2024, SCE, jointly with PG&E and SDG&E, submitted a request pursuant to Rule 16.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, seeking an extension of time to comply with Ordering Paragraph (OP) 9 of D.24-05-065. OP 9 requires each IOU to submit a Tier 2 advice letter modifying its Green Tariff within 120 days of D.24-05-065's adoption. The IOUs' request asserted that they could not reasonably prepare complete and accurate Green Tariff modifications until after the Commission resolves key implementation details identified in the June 5, 2024 Ruling.⁴¹ That ruling

³⁹ PG&E Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 10.

⁴⁰ CPA Opening Comments on April 1, 2025 Ruling at 3.

⁴¹ *Ruling Directing Responses to Questions Regarding Implementation of Decision 24-05-065*, issued June 5, 2024.

solicited party comment on program design issues necessary to define the modified Green Tariff structure. The IOUs requested that the Commission extend the submission deadline for their Tier 2 implementation advice letters to 90 days following issuance of the Commission's decision on the June 5, 2024 Ruling. On September 5, 2024, the extension request was granted.

As this decision resolves the implementation details identified in the June 5, 2024 Ruling, the IOUs shall submit their Tier 2 advice letters modifying their Green Tariff, as ordered in D.24-05-065, no later than 90 days following the issue date of this decision. The Tier 2 advice letters shall also include a timeline and transition plan for moving legacy Green Tariff customers to the modified Green Tariff if and when the advice letter is approved.

To aid in the implementation of the modified Green Tariff, this decision authorizes the IOUs to establish dedicated balancing accounts for the modified Green Tariff program to ensure transparent tracking and appropriate recovery of program-related costs and revenues. These balancing accounts will record incremental program administration costs, such as those costs associated with renewable attributes or RECs provided to modified Green Tariff participants, customer billed revenues associated with the program, any required true-up of attribute pricing, and applicable interest. Requiring the IOUs to establish these balancing accounts through Tier 1 advice letters will allow for timely implementation of the modified Green Tariff program while maintaining appropriate Commission oversight over program accounting and cost recovery.

This decision also finds it appropriate to require the IOUs to close out their existing Green Tariff memorandum and/or balancing accounts after all

existing Green Tariff customers have been transitioned to the modified Green Tariff program. Closing these legacy accounts through a Tier 2 advice letter process will ensure an orderly transition between the existing and modified program structures and provide an opportunity for Commission review of the final account balances and disposition of remaining program costs. To the extent any undercollections remain following account closure, those amounts shall be reviewed and addressed through each utility's subsequent ERRA compliance proceeding, consistent with this decision's determination that ERRA proceedings provide an appropriate forum for oversight and review of modified Green Tariff program costs.

5. DAC-GT and CSGT Implementation

This decision makes necessary modifications to DAC-GT and CSGT program funding, program evaluation, and implementation requirements for CCAs proposing to administer new DAC-GT programs.

5.1. Program Funding

AB 1207 (Stats. 2025, Ch. 117) discontinues the provision for the DAC-GT and CSGT programs to be funded by available greenhouse gas (GHG) allowance proceeds, beginning July 1, 2026. Currently, the IOUs are directed by D.18-06-027 to first fund the programs using available GHG allowance proceeds, and, if those funds are exhausted, public purpose program surcharge collections. Pursuant to AB 1207, this decision supersedes D.18-06-027 to direct the IOUs to fund the DAC-GT and CSGT programs using public purpose program surcharge collections. Each IOU must submit a Tier 1 advice letter updating its DAC-GT tariff to reflect this funding change, and shall appropriately account for this

funding change when requesting recovery of DAC-GT and CSGT program costs.⁴²

5.2. Program Evaluation

Because the DAC-GT cost containment cap was only approved on July 24, 2025, this decision supersedes D.24-05-065 with respect to DAC-GT program evaluation.⁴³ D.24-05-065 specified that program evaluation of the DAC-GT must take place by 2027. It is reasonable to provide some time for new and modified programs to launch and take hold before initiating the next DAC-GT program evaluation. Energy Division shall have two years from the issue date of this decision to share the results of the DAC-GT and CSGT program evaluation.

5.3. New DAC-GT Programs Administered by Community Choice Aggregators

D.18-06-027 provided that CCAs may seek to offer their own DAC-GT programs (consistent with Commission requirements) via a Tier 3 advice letter. Several CCAs have followed this process to propose administering their own DAC-GT programs.⁴⁴ These proposals have been straightforward and did not

⁴² As determined in Section 4.1 of this decision, the Commission will consider the merits of each IOU's cost recovery proposal in their respective ERRAs compliance proceedings, beginning with each IOU's next most feasible ERRAs compliance proceeding. In comments to the proposed decision, SCE states that all remaining forecasts and expenditures of GHG cap-and-invest allowance revenues for DAC-GT should continue to occur in the ERRAs forecast proceeding.

⁴³ Resolution E-5367 *Pursuant to D.24-05-065, Approving with Modifications Pacific Gas & Electric Company's and Southern California Edison Company's DAC-GT Cost Containment Cap Proposal Updates*, issued July 30, 2025.

⁴⁴ See Resolution E-5102 *Approving with Modification, Clean Power Alliance's Tariffs to Implement the Disadvantaged Communities Green Tariff and Community Solar Green Tariff Programs*, issued

Footnote continued on next page.

require the level of scrutiny with which staff typically review Tier 3 advice letters. In addition, we do not anticipate future CCA proposals to require such scrutiny, given that we have already specified the main requirements that all DAC-GT programs must satisfy. It is reasonable to reduce the Commission staff's administrative burden by requiring CCAs to propose new DAC-GT programs via a Tier 2 advice letter. Commission staff will maintain the discretion to dispose of these advice letters via resolution if the advice letter is protested or a resolution is otherwise warranted. This decision supersedes D.18-06-027's requirement that CCAs seeking to administer new DAC-GT programs submit a Tier 3 advice letter.

6. Program Reporting for Modified DAC-GT, Modified Green Tariff, CSGT, and Community Renewable Energy Program

D.24-05-065 replaced existing reporting requirements for the various Green Access Programs with a requirement to post program metrics to the DGStats website quarterly.⁴⁵ D.24-05-065 OP 6 requires program administrators to replace

November 9, 2020; Resolution E-5124 *Pursuant to D.18-06-027, Approving with Modification, Community Choice Aggregator Tariffs to Implement the Disadvantaged Communities Green Tariff and Community Solar Green Tariff Programs* (approving DAC-GT programs proposed by CleanPowerSF, East Bay Community Energy, Marin Clean Energy, Peninsula Clean Energy and San Jose Clean Energy), issued April 16, 2021; Resolution E-5130 *Pursuant to D.18-06-027, Approving with Modification, Community Choice Aggregator Tariffs to Implement the Disadvantaged Communities Green Tariff and Community Solar Green Tariff Programs* (approving DAC-GT programs proposed by Lancaster Choice Energy, Pico Rivera Municipal Energy and San Jacinto Power), issued September 13, 2021; and Resolution E-5246 *Pursuant to D.18-06-027, Approving with Modifications San Diego Community Power's Tariffs to Implement the Disadvantaged Communities Green Tariff and Community Solar Green Tariff Programs*, issued March 20, 2023. In addition to the above approved CCA DAC-GT programs, Orange County Power Authority submitted Advice Letter 13-E on August 14, 2025 for approval of a new DAC-GT program.

⁴⁵ D.24-05-065 at OPs 6, 7, 8.

prior Green Access Programs reporting requirements with quarterly posting of program metrics on DGStats. OP 8 orders the IOUs and participating CCAs to submit a joint Tier 1 advice letter outlining what was agreed upon at a July 19, 2024 workshop that discussed specific data elements and data formats for program reporting on the DGStats platform.

On August 29, 2024, the IOUs and participating CCAs submitted Joint Advice Letter SCE 5361-E, which outlined the results of the workshop, including a consensus on the proposed reporting metrics. Advice Letter SCE 5361-E was approved on October 16, 2024. On November 14, 2024, the DGStats vendor held a subsequent workshop with the program administrators to discuss the potential process for integrating program data into the DGStats platform. Following this second workshop, the contract for management of DGStats expired. A new contract was awarded to Energy Solutions in 2025.⁴⁶ Energy Division staff, the program administrators, and the DGStats vendor are finalizing the data submission template necessary for the inclusion of community renewable energy program data on the platform and are prepared to transition to online program reporting.⁴⁷

This decision directs participating program administrators to complete the transition of required reporting to DGStats or its successor domain within 180

⁴⁶ On November 6, 2024, the DGStats contract was released for competitive solicitation by Southern California Edison Company. Energy Solutions was selected as the winning bidder on March 5, 2025.

⁴⁷ Draft Resolution E-5436 *Increased Funding to Maintain and Expand the California Distributed Generation Statistics Website and Orders to Improve Data Collection Quality in the Investor-Owned Utilities' Online Interconnection Application Interfaces*, available for comment on January 15, 2026.

days after the issue date of this decision. Reporting dates shall remain consistent with existing reporting dates (30 days from end of reporting quarter) and July will serve as the annual reporting submission period. This will coincide with the first semi-annual reporting period of the year (30 days from the end of the second quarter).

This decision authorizes cost recovery for implementation of the reporting requirements adopted in D.24-05-065. Because D.24-05-065 replaced prior reporting requirements, we do not expect a significant increase in the program administrators' administrative budget line items for reporting. The costs of DAC-GT, modified Green Tariff, CSGT, and integrating community renewable energy program data into DGStats, or its successor domain, shall be allocated evenly among the participating program administrators (*i.e.*, total cost divided by the number of program administrators). Participating program administrators shall enter into co-funding agreements with SCE, the DGStats contract holder, within 180 days after the issue date of this decision, and document the details and completion of these agreements in their Tier 2 DAC-GT annual budget advice letters.⁴⁸ For DAC-GT, these costs shall also be documented in the program administrators' regulatory compliance budgets, which are included in their Tier 2 annual budget advice letters.

7. Summary of Public Comment

Rule 1.18 allows any member of the public to submit written comment in any Commission proceeding using the "Public Comment" tab of the online

⁴⁸ D.24-05-065 revised the submission date of the DAC-GT Program Administrators' annual budget advice letters from February 1st to April 1st.

Docket Card for that proceeding on the Commission's website. Rule 1.18(b) requires that relevant written comment submitted in a proceeding be summarized in the final decision issued in that proceeding. As of the submission date of this matter, the Commission received no relevant written public comments in this proceeding.

8. Procedural Matters

This decision affirms all rulings made by the ALJ and assigned Commissioner in this proceeding. All motions not ruled on are deemed denied.

9. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of ALJ Valerie U. Kao 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. SEIA and CCSA (jointly), PG&E, SDG&E, Dimension Energy, Joint CCAs and CCSF (jointly), SCE, Clean Coalition, and SBUA timely filed comments to the proposed decision. PG&E, Joint CCAs and CCSF (jointly), SCE, and The Utility Reform Network (TURN) timely filed reply comments.

In response to party comments, the proposed decision has been revised to:

- For the community renewable energy program:
 - Restate D.24-05-065's conclusions regarding whether community renewable energy projects avoid transmission, distribution, or generation capacity costs.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ SEIA and CCSA Comments to proposed decision at 4-6.

- To avoid unnecessary implementation and administrative costs, direct the IOUs to submit a separate Tier 3 advice letter detailing their implementation plans for the community renewable energy program. The IOUs shall submit this Tier 3 advice letter only in the event that they identify available external funding that adequately provides for the required bill credit as specified by D.24-05-065 and this decision; additional developer compensation; and all community renewable energy program implementation, marketing and administration costs.⁵⁰
- Provide further direction regarding calculation of the bill credit for low-income subscribers.⁵¹
- Provide 90 days from the issue date of this decision for the IOUs to submit a Tier 2 advice letter proposing their respective Community Renewable Energy tariffs.⁵²
- Provide that the IOUs may discontinue the community renewable energy program, if no developer has executed a ReMAT PPA for a new community renewable energy project

⁵⁰ PG&E Comments to proposed decision at 3. SCE Comments to proposed decision at 2-3. SDG&E Comments to proposed decision at 4. Dimension Energy Comments to proposed decision at 5-7. SBUA Comments to proposed decision at 1. TURN Reply Comments to proposed decision at 1-4. SCE Reply Comments to proposed decision at 1-3.

⁵¹ Dimension Energy Comments to proposed decision at 5. Joint CCAs and CCSF Comments to proposed decision at 2-4.

⁵² SCE Comments to proposed decision at 4.

within two years after the disposal date of their Tier 2 Community Renewable Energy tariff advice letters, by submitting a Tier 1 advice letter.⁵³

- Provide that any CCA or ESP may begin and end its participation in the community renewable energy program at any time by submitting a Tier 1 advice letter.⁵⁴
- Address implementation details for CSGT, in recognition that Clean Power Alliance continues to administer CSGT projects after D.24-05-065 discontinued CSGT.⁵⁵
- Modify the timeline for reporting on DGStats to account for contingency on the platform being made ready to receive and process Green Access Program reporting.⁵⁶
- Authorize the IOUs to establish new balancing accounts to record and recover modified Green Tariff costs and to close historical Green Tariff memorandum and balancing costs once those tariffs are fully vacated.⁵⁷

⁵³ SDG&E Comments to proposed decision at 3-4. PG&E Comments to proposed decision at 3-4.

⁵⁴ Joint CCAs and CCSF Comments to proposed decision at 5-7.

⁵⁵ Joint CCAs and CCSF Comments to proposed decision at 8-10.

⁵⁶ PG&E Comments to proposed decision at 6.

⁵⁷ SCE comments to proposed decision at 3. PG&E comments to proposed decision at 4. SDG&E comments to proposed decision at 4. Joint CCAs and CCSF reply comments to proposed decision at 3.

10. Assignment of Proceeding

John Reynolds is the assigned Commissioner and Valerie U. Kao is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. D.24-05-065 established a new customer community renewable energy program in accordance with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c), with certain implementation details to be determined in a subsequent decision.

2. D.24-05-065 concluded that the new customer community renewable energy program should use current PURPA-compliant tariffs, such as ReMAT and the PURPA Standard Offer Contract, as a cost foundation.

3. D.24-05-065 referred to potential grant funding from the federal Inflation Reduction Act and U.S. EPA's Solar for All competition. D.24-05-065 also concluded it would be reasonable to use \$33 million appropriated to the Commission for the community renewable energy program and storage-backed renewable generation programs.

4. Public Law 119-21 accelerates the expiration of federal tax credits to the end of 2025 for residential projects and 2027 for commercial projects.

5. As part of California's 2025-2026 Budget Bill, \$33 million previously appropriated to the Commission for community renewable energy program usage and storage-backed renewable generation programs, reverted to the General Fund.

6. The U.S. EPA provided notice that it was terminating California's Solar for All award.

7. Contracts under ReMAT must be initiated for up to 20 years of deliveries. The PURPA Standard Offer Contract allows for a 12-year maximum contract length for new facilities.

8. Providing compensation in excess of PURPA avoided costs would not comply with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c).

9. Increasing the maximum project size to five MW and increasing the statewide program capacity cap would require legislative changes.

10. ReMAT includes differentiation in contract price based on the timing of expected energy delivery of a project, including projects that utilize energy storage, through different product types.

11. SDG&E's proposal for recovery of stranded Green Tariff legacy costs was addressed in its 2023 ERRA compliance proceeding.

12. The modified Green Tariff program is voluntary and fully funded by participants.

13. The Commission's Executive Director granted IOUs' request to extend the final date to submit their modified Green Tariff implementation advice letters to 90 days after resolution of issues involving the implementation of D.24-05-065.

14. AB 1207 discontinues the provision for the DAC-GT program to be funded by available GHG allowance proceeds, beginning July 1, 2026.

15. The DAC-GT cost containment cap was approved by Resolution E-5367 on July 24, 2025.

16. D.24-05-065 directed program administrators of tariffs in the California Renewable Energy Portfolio to conduct data collection and reporting on program operation and outcomes for public posting on the DGStats website. D.24-05-065

specified that this requirement replaces reporting requirements in D.15-01-051, D.16-05-006, D.18-06-027, Resolution E-4999, D.21-12-036 and Resolution E-5028.

17. CCAs that have proposed new DAC-GT programs have had straightforward implementation proposals that do not require heightened scrutiny through a Tier 3 advice letter.

18. The Commission has specified the main requirements for all DAC-GT programs.

19. The cost to implement D.24-05-065's reporting requirement should not significantly increase program administrators' administrative costs associated with reporting.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Commission should adopt a customer Community Renewable Energy tariff consistent with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(c).

2. Each IOU should use its ReMAT tariff as the cost and generation resource foundation for its Community Renewable Energy tariff.

3. To minimize impacts to nonparticipating customers, CCAs that participate in the program should align their tariffs with the ReMAT pricing and PPAs of the IOU in whose service territory they operate.

4. CCAs and ESPs that notified the Commission that they will participate in the community renewable energy program, in accordance with Pub. Util. Code Section 769.3(b), should begin and end participation in the program at any time by notifying the Commission via a Tier 1 advice letter.

5. It is reasonable to consider each IOU's Green Tariff cost recovery proposal in its ERRRA compliance proceeding.

6. It is reasonable to discontinue all required submittals and the annual forums and advisory board meetings as oversight mechanisms of the modified Green Tariff program.

7. Procurement oversight of the modified Green Tariff program through IOU PRG meetings is sufficient.

8. Cost oversight of the modified Green Tariff program through ERRA proceedings is sufficient.

9. It is reasonable to direct that proposed modifications to each IOU's Green Tariff program shall be made via a Tier 2 advice letter within 90 days following the issue date of this decision.

10. It is reasonable to direct the IOUs to submit Tier 1 advice letters within 30 days after the issue date of this decision to establish balancing accounts to record and recover modified Green Tariff costs.

11. It is reasonable to direct the IOUs to each submit a Tier 2 advice letter to close out their existing Green Tariff memorandum and/or balancing accounts following complete customer migration to the modified Green Tariff program.

12. It is reasonable to direct the IOUs to update their DAC-GT tariffs to provide that the program will be funded using public purpose program surcharge collections.

13. It is reasonable to provide time for new and modified programs to launch and take hold before initiating the next DAC-GT program evaluation.

14. It is reasonable to require CCAs seeking to offer new DAC-GT programs to do so via a Tier 2 advice letter.

15. It is reasonable to direct participating program administrators to complete the transition of required reporting to DGStats, or its successor domain, within 90 days of receiving notification that the platform is available and ready to receive and process program reporting.

16. It is reasonable to authorize recovery of the costs to implement D.24-05-065's reporting requirement and to specify a date by which the program administrators must complete their transition of required reporting to DGStats.

17. All ALJ and assigned Commissioner rulings in this proceeding should be affirmed.

18. All motions not ruled on to date should be denied.

19. The Commission should close consolidated A.22-05-022, *et al.*

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Within 90 days after the issue date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall each submit a Tier 2 advice letter to propose a new customer Community Renewable Energy tariff in accordance with Decision 24-05-065 and this decision.

2. If, following the launch of the Community Renewable Energy tariff, an external funding source is identified, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall each submit a Tier 3 advice letter detailing and specifying the type of external funds to be contributed toward the Community Renewable Energy compensation rate, and any Community Renewable Energy tariff modifications

needed to align their community renewable energy program with any terms and conditions tied to those external funds. This Tier 3 advice letter shall also include a program implementation and marketing plan as described in this decision, and establishment of a balancing account to record incremental costs for implementation, marketing, and administration of the Community Renewable Energy tariff. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 769.3(c)(3), the program's costs shall not be paid by nonparticipating customers in excess of the avoided costs.

3. Community choice aggregators and electric service providers that intend to participate in the community renewable energy program, in accordance with Public Utilities Code Section 769.3(b), shall submit a Tier 1 advice letter to notify the Commission when they begin or end participation in the program.

4. This decision supersedes Decision (D.) 15-01-051 Ordering Paragraph 10 (required monthly and annual reports); Ordering Paragraph 11 (required annual program forums); and Ordering Paragraphs 15 and 17 (required advisory groups) with respect to program oversight of San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company's programs. The modified Green Tariff reporting and meeting requirements in D.15-01-051 Ordering Paragraphs 10, 11, 15, and 17 shall cease as of the issue date of this decision.

5. Within 90 days after the issue date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall each submit a Tier 2 advice letter modifying its Green Tariff as ordered in Decision 24-05-065. The Tier 2 advice letter shall also include a

timeline and transition plan for moving legacy Green Tariff customers to the modified Green Tariff if and when the Tier 2 advice letter is approved.

6. Within 30 days after the issue date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall each submit a Tier 1 advice letter to propose a balancing account to record and recover modified Green Tariff program costs. These balancing accounts will record incremental program administration costs, such as those costs associated with renewable attributes or Renewable Energy Credits provided to modified Green Tariff participants, customer billed revenues associated with the program, any required true-up of attribute pricing, and applicable interest.

7. Within 60 days of the date that their last Green Tariff customer has been migrated to the new modified Green Tariff program, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company must each submit a Tier 2 advice letter closing out their Green Tariff Memorandum and/or Balancing Accounts. Any undercollected costs shall be addressed in each utility's subsequent Energy Resource Recovery Account compliance proceeding.

8. In the event that no developer has executed a Renewable Market Adjusting Tariff power purchase agreement for a new community renewable energy project within two years after the disposal date of their Tier 2 Community Renewable Energy tariff advice letters, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company may discontinue their community renewable energy program by submitting a Tier 1 advice letter.

9. Within 30 days after the issue date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company must each submit a Tier 1 advice letter updating the tariff for their Disadvantaged Communities-Green Tariff program to provide that, consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 748.5(c), the program will be funded using public purpose program surcharge collections. The Community Solar Green Tariff program will continue to be funded using public purpose program surcharge collections, consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 748.5(c).

10. This decision supersedes Ordering Paragraph 14 of Decision (D.) 24-05-065 with respect to the program evaluation of the Disadvantaged Communities-Green Tariff (DAC-GT) and Community Solar Green Tariff (CSGT) programs. The DAC-GT and CSGT program evaluation shall continue to be completed in accordance with Ordering Paragraph 7 of D.18-06-027. Energy Division staff will share the results (including recommendations) of the evaluation with the service list no later than two years from the issue date of this decision.

11. This decision supersedes Ordering Paragraph 17 of Decision (D.) 18-06-027 with respect to the requirement for community choice aggregator (CCA) Disadvantaged Communities-Green Tariff (DAC-GT) programs receiving funds consistent with that decision. New CCA DAC-GT programs receiving funds consistent with D.18-06-027 shall be implemented by a Tier 2 advice letter.

12. Within 90 days after receiving notification from the California Distributed Generation Statistics (DG Stats) vendor that the DGStats platform is available

and ready to receive and process program reporting, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and Program Administrators of tariffs in the California Renewable Energy Portfolio shall complete their transition of required reporting of Disadvantaged Communities-Green Tariff, Green Tariff, Community Solar Green Tariff, and community renewable energy program data to the DGStats website.

13. Within 180 days after the issue date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Program Administrators of tariffs in the California Renewable Energy Portfolio shall execute co-funding agreements with Southern California Edison Company that are consistent with Section 5 of this decision for the costs of Disadvantaged Communities-Green Tariff, Green Tariff, Community Solar Green Tariff, and community renewable energy program data integration into the California Distributed Generation Statistics website.

14. Applications 22-05-022, 22-05-023, and 22-05-024 are closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at Sacramento, California.