Docket No.: A.25-05-011

Exhibit No.: CalCCA-24

Date: October 6, 2025

Sponsor/Witness: Barry (PG&E)

EXHIBIT CALCCA-24

PG&E Response to CalCCA 5.12

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Energy Resource Recovery Account 2026 Forecast
Application 25-05-011
Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	CalCCA_005-Q012
PG&E File Name:	ERRA-2026-PGE-Forecast_DR_CalCCA_005-Q012
Request Date:	September 26, 2025
Requester DR No.:	005
Requesting Party:	California Community Choice Association
Requester:	Nikhil Vijaykar
Date Sent:	October 3, 2025
PG&E Witness(es):	Donna Barry – Energy Policy and Procurement

QUESTION 012

Referring to PG&E's rebuttal testimony, page 4-4, lines 4-16: Does PG&E agree that actual PCIA resource costs and benefits could have been *higher* or *lower* than forecasted costs and benefits? And does PG&E agree that bundled customers would have benefitted when the actual above market costs were less than the forecasted above market costs? If not, please explain.

ANSWER 012

Yes, actual PCIA resources costs and benefits used to set the PCIA rate could have been higher or lower than forecasted costs and benefits.

PG&E agrees that if the actual total portfolio indifference calculation above-market costs used to set the PCIA rate were lower (less) than the forecast, this result would have benefited bundled customers since their generation rates would have been higher had departing load paid a lower PCIA rate, all else being equal.

The counterpoint is also true - if the actual total portfolio indifference calculation above-market costs used to set the PCIA rate were higher than forecast, this result would have hurt bundled customers since their generation rates would have been lower had departing load paid a higher PCIA rate, all else being equal.