CPUC Docket: A.26-01-003 et al.
Exhibit Number: TURN-05
Date: November 25, 2026

A.26-01-003 et al.

Ex. TURN-05

SDG&E responses to TURN DR 8, Questions 1-8

San Diego Gas & Electric Company's (SDG&E) responses are as follows:

1. Please provide workpapers for SDG&E's rebuttal testimony, including live Excel spreadsheets supporting all tables and figures.

SDG&E response to Q1:

SDG&E's rebuttal testimony Exh. SDG&E-06 primarily responds to recommendations and arguments presented in intervenor testimony and does not introduce new analysis supporting separate tables or figures. To the extent the rebuttal testimony relies on quantitative analyses previously presented in SDG&E's direct or supplemental testimony, the corresponding workpapers have been provided with those submissions or in response to related discovery.

2. SDG&E's rebuttal testimony at pp. 18-19 discusses its proposed My Energy Center enhancement project.
    a. SDG&E states that "Allowing customers to confirm enrollment status before applying again will help reduce duplicate submissions and avoid unnecessary processing costs." Has SDG&E estimated these potential cost savings which may result from the enhancement project? If so, please provide those estimates and SDG&E's underlying calculations and assumptions. If not, please state so.

SDG&E response to Q2.a:

No, SDG&E has not estimated the potential cost savings specifically associated with reducing duplicate submissions and unnecessary processing costs resulting from the proposed My Energy Center enhancement.

However, SDG&E provided the following response to TURN's data request TURN-SDG&E-006 regarding general, expected reduction in call center and processing costs related to the proposed My Energy Center enhancements:

> "By enabling electronic submission and processing of applications and forms through My Energy Center, SDG&E expects to reduce postage, document handling, scanning, other manual processing activities and customer calls while improving processing timeliness and customer experience.
>
> Based on current processing activities, SDG&E estimates that each transaction submitted electronically rather than through mail could reduce manual processing time by approximately 3 to 5 minutes per transaction, resulting in estimated administrative savings of $1.90 to $3.10 per transaction, depending on the transaction type and level of manual handling avoided. Customers would also reduce transaction time by several days, improving enrollment time and overall customer experience. Lastly, alerts and reminders would appear in SDG&E's My Energy Center and would act as another layer of customer notifications to help maintain enrollment in CARE or FERA. As a result, SDG&E expects a reduction in customer calls and email inquiries regarding the status of

Enrollment."[1]

b. Did SDG&E consider alternatives to its $895k enhancement project, including maintaining the status quo? If so, please identify those alternatives, the associated costs, and the trade-offs SDG&E evaluated to reach its current proposal. If not, please state so.

SDG&E response to Q2.b:

No, SDG&E did not conduct a separate evaluation of alternatives to the proposed My Energy Center enhancement. If, on the other hand, SDG&E maintained status quo, it would not realize the savings benefits identified in the response to Q2.a, i.e., reduction in manual processing time of approximately 3 to 5 minutes per transaction, with an associated estimated administrative savings of $1.90 to $3.10 per transaction.

c. SDG&E states that 78 percent of CARE and FERA customers already use My Energy Center (p. 19).

i. Please provide this breakdown separately for CARE and FERA customers.

SDG&E response to Q2.c.i:

SDG&E's breakdown for CARE is approximately 219,000 customers and for FERA is approximately 22,000 customers.

ii. How do the remaining customers access information on CARE and FERA and manage their enrollment? Please identify all existing alternatives to My Energy Center.

SDG&E response to Q2.c.ii:

Currently, SDG&E's CARE and FERA customers may access information on CARE and FERA at www.sdge.com/assistance, manage their enrollment at www.sdge.com/care, or by calling or emailing SDG&E's customer assistance center.

iii. Has SDG&E evaluated or hypothesized reasons why some customers do not use My Energy Center? If so, please identify those reasons.

SDG&E response to Q2.c.iii:

No, SDG&E has not evaluated reasons why some customers do not use My Energy Center.

[1] TURN-02-Atch01, response to Question 11.b of TURN-SDG&E-006 at pp. 74-75.

3. SDG&E's rebuttal testimony at p. 22 restates SDG&E's request to increase the CARE PEV cap from 6 percent up to 20 percent.
    a. How did SDG&E land on 20 percent as the appropriate level of PEV for its proposal? Please provide SDG&E's calculations and underlying assumptions.

SDG&E response to Q3.a:

SDG&E did not derive the proposed 20% cap from a formula identifying 20% as the single optimal verification level. Rather, SDG&E selected a cap of up to 20% based on changed program conditions and the need for greater flexibility to protect program integrity. The existing 6% annual cap was established when SDG&E's CARE enrollment was well below the Commission's 90% enrollment goal and that enrollment has now exceeded 100% of eligible customers from Program Years 2020 to 2025, making reconsideration of the existing cap reasonable.[2]

SDG&E's supporting analysis also considered the incremental administrative costs of additional verification and the offsetting reduction in CARE subsidies attributable to customers determined to be ineligible.[3] That analysis indicates that the proposal would strengthen eligibility accuracy while producing modest net benefits for non-CARE customers.[4]

    b. Did SDG&E consider any alternatives to 20 percent, including the status quo? If so, please identify those alternatives, the associated costs, and the trade-offs SDG&E evaluated to reach its current proposal. If not, please state so.

SDG&E response to Q3.b:

No, SDG&E did not prepare a comprehensive analysis of the estimated rate and bill impacts of other alternative PEV caps, including maintaining the existing 6% cap.

4. SDG&E's rebuttal testimony at p. 25 discusses its proposed CBO capitation payments for CARE and FERA.
    a. In the previous IQPs cycle, what was the average outreach cost per enrollee for enrollees introduced to (i) CARE and (ii) FERA through SDG&E's general marketing? Please show cost estimates and assumptions.

SDG&E response to Q4.a:

SDG&E uses a multi-tactic approach to drive program awareness and enrollment, recognizing that customers typically require approximately five to seven touchpoints before taking action. As a result, SDG&E cannot reliably determine which individual interaction resulted in enrollment or attribute enrollment nor does SDG&E track costs by individual tactics. Notwithstanding this

[2] SDG&E-04 at 10-14
[3] Id.
[4] Id.

consideration, SDG&E provides the average Outreach cost per enrollee for Program Years 2016 through 2025 for CARE and FERA.

CARE	Outreach Cost	No of New Enrollees (Self-Certification)	Average Cost
2025	$2,359,165	60,394	$39.06
2024	$2,521,978	69,721	$36.17
2023	$2,564,022	66,468	$38.58
2022	$2,492,218	70,319	$35.44
2021	$2,184,415	63,875	$34.20
2020	$2,585,404	75,839	$34.09
2019	$2,933,510	75,275	$38.97
2018	$2,727,574	60,426	$45.14
2017	$2,681,048	65,032	$41.23
2016	$2,157,008	64,657	$33.36

FERA	ME&O Cost	No of New Enrollees (Self-Certification)	Average Cost
2025	$358,404	11,984	$29.91
2024	$463,170	7649	$60.55
2023	$388,638	3017	$128.82
2022	$182,036	2336	$77.93
2021	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2020	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2019	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2018	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2017	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2016	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available

Notes:

(1) Data Source: 2016-2025 Annual Reports, Tables CARE-1, CARE-2, FERA-1, FERA-2.

(2) For 2016-2021, CARE and FERA outreach costs were combined under CARE Outreach Costs. There was no separate reporting for FERA during this period.

(3) Outreach costs covered only the self-certified new enrollees through online, paper, phone and capitation enrollment methods as identified in Tables CARE-2 and FERA-2.

(4) SDG&E's general outreach costs for all tactics and includes costs such as capitation fees, marketing, customer education, and community engagement.

b. In the previous IQPs cycle, what was the average outreach cost per enrollee for enrollees introduced to (i) CARE and (ii) FERA through CBO capitation?

SDG&E response to Q4.b:

The average cost per enrollee introduced to CARE and FERA through CBO capitation was $30. This amount represents the capitation payment associated only with the CBO working with the customer to complete a successful enrollment and does not reflect the underlying marketing, outreach, education, engagement, and costs incurred to generate that enrollment.

c. If the answers to (a) and (b) differ, please explain why this might be the case. In SDG&E's view, why is outreach through SDG&E or CBOs generally more or less costly on a per-enrollee basis?

SDG&E response to Q4.c:

The response to Q4b is the average cost per enrollment through CBO capitation and reflects only the capitation payment associated with a successful CARE or FERA enrollment. In contrast, the response to Q4a is the total cost associated with a completed enrollment as reflected in SDG&E's outreach costs for all tactics and includes costs such as capitation fees, marketing, customer education, and community engagement.

5. SDG&E's rebuttal testimony at p. 26 discusses its proposal for a standalone FERA application form. SDG&E states that "Res. E-5448 denied incremental funding for a separate FERA application based on the business case proposed to the Commission in its AL 4646-E. The Resolution did not prohibit future consideration of a standalone FERA application."

   a. What elements of SDG&E's proposal for a standalone FERA form, in this case, does SDG&E contend are different from the proposal evaluated by Res. E-5448? Please list each element.

SDG&E response to Q5.a:

SDG&E did not propose any new elements to its standalone FERA form proposal as evaluated by Resolution E-5448. SDG&E was seeking funding for a new standalone FERA application. If it was approved, SDG&E would have commenced planning for the new application, including consideration of any relevant new elements.

b. If SDG&E does not contend that its proposal contains new elements to list in response to (a), please explain what factors have changed to explain why the Commission should reconsider its proposal in this case.

SDG&E response to Q5.b:

As mentioned under response to question 5a, SDG&E's proposal did not specify new elements. The Resolution, however, states:

> In alignment with statute, SDG&E may utilize its existing FERA budget to create a standalone application. Should SDG&E decide to move forward with creating a standalone FERA application, we expect that SDG&E will work with Energy Division before implementation to share more information about how the standalone application will be implemented, how it will continue to have strong coordination with the CARE program, how success of this new effort will be tracked, and how the program is managing the customer experience concerns noted above.[5]

Therefore, SDG&E will consult with Energy Division according to this guidance before implementation of a standalone FERA application.

6. SDG&E's rebuttal testimony at p. 26 discusses its proposal for a standalone FERA application form.
    a. Under SDG&E's proposal, what are the isolated costs of the standalone FERA application form in each year of the IQPs cycle? Please identify the one-time set-up costs and ongoing annual costs of the standalone form, as compared to the combined CARE/FERA application form.

SDG&E response to Q6.a:

SDG&E did not isolate costs of the standalone FERA application form each year of the IQP cycle. If SDG&E decides to pursue a standalone FERA application form in the IQP cycle, it will consult with Energy Division according to the guidance noted in its response to Question 5.b. above.

    b. Under SDG&E's proposal, what are the other costs associated with the standalone FERA application form, such as costs to educate customers about the new form? Please identify all costs associated with the standalone form and identify which budget category (e.g. FERA outreach) each cost falls into.

SDG&E response to Q6.b:

SDG&E did not propose any additional costs associated with the implementation of a standalone FERA application form.

7. SDG&E's supplemental testimony at p. KO-12 acknowledges that administrative costs would be higher from performing additional PEV up to a higher PEV cap of 20%. Please quantify the additional administrative costs from SDG&E's higher proposed PEV cap, providing underlying data inputs and assumptions.

SDG&E response to Q7:

[5] Resolution E-5448, March 3, 2026, at 6.

See Attachment "A.26-01-003 SDGE CARE PEV 6 to 20% Workpapers.xlsx"

8. SDG&E's response to TURN DR 6, Q21 discusses the Base Services Charge (BSC). Please provide SDG&E's Q3 2026 BSC quarterly implementation metrics, as provided to the Demand Flexibility service list on 10/30/2026.

SDG&E response to Q8: See Attachment "SDGE Base Services Charge Quarterly Metrics_Q3_2026 10.30.26.xlsx"

END OF RESPONSE

Impact of SDG&E CARE Post Enrollment Verification (PEV) Proposed Changes

Item	6% PEV Cap	20% PEV Cap	Difference
CARE PEV Expense (PY 2028-2033)	$ 442,144	$ 1,473,812	$ 1,031,668
CARE Rate Discount Impact (PY 2028-2033)	$ (29,925,260)	$ (99,750,866)	$ (69,825,606)
Net Impact (PY 2028-2033)	$ (29,483,116)	$ (98,277,054)	$ (68,793,938)

Assumptions:

Average PEV Cost is a blended rate of Probability model PEV cost and High Usage PEV cost

PEV admin and discount cost assumptions are PEV Probability Model only (HEU PEV volume varies depending on customer usage)

PEV Model Success Rates based on 2024 Actuals and forcasted to be consistent from 2028-2033

PEV Model Cost and CARE Rate Discount budget costs based on SDG&E Application Attachment G tab B-1 CARE Budget Details

References		**Date**
ALJ Ruling Directing Supplemental Testimony	607364703.PDF	28-May-26
PGE et all Email Procedural Clarification Supp. Test	https://pgera.azure	1-May-26
AC Scoping Memo and Ruling	604541786.PDF	7-Apr-26
AC Ruing Attachment 5 Utility Supplemental Testimony	604536938.PDF	7-Apr-26

CARE/FERA Supplemental Testimony

4. SDG&E

   a) Provide a comprehensive analysis of the estimated rate and bill impacts associated with SDG&E's proposal to increase the PEV cap from 6% to 20%, including impacts to:

      i) CARE participants;

      ii) non-participating (non-CARE) residential customers;

      iii) non-residential customers.

Rate and Bill Impact - Electric

Class Average Rates	Original January 6 Year Application with 20% PEV 2033 (Peak) (¢/kWh)	Scenario: 6 Year Application with 6% PEV 2033 (Peak) (¢/kWh)	Variance (¢/kWh)	Variance (%)
Residential	43.334	43.400	0.066	0.15%
Small Commercial	39.428	39.492	0.064	0.16%
Medium and Large C&I	38.329	38.393	0.064	0.17%
Agriculture	27.540	27.603	0.063	0.23%
Lighting	34.942	34.946	0.004	0.01%
System Total	**39.473**	**39.537**	**0.064**	**0.16%**

Typical Residential Bill[1]	($/Month)	($/Month)	($/Month)	(%)
Non-CARE	187.28	187.52	0.24	0.13%
CARE[2]	104.55	104.55	0.00	0.00%

1. Typical residential electric customer using 400 kWh per month
2. CARE customers are exempt from CARE specific programs
3. Decrease calculated comparing 2033, which is the electric peak year impact, to current effective rates as of 1/1/26. Rate increase will be the same for bundled and unbundled customers. Percentage change reflects comparison to total bundled rates.

Rate and Bill Impact - Gas

Class Average Rates	Original January 6 Year Application with 20% PEV 2032 (Peak) (¢/therm)	Scenario: 6 Year Application with 6% PEV 2032 (Peak) (¢/therm)	Variance (¢/therm)	Variance (%)
Core				
Residential	278.294	278.537	0.243	0.09%
Commerical/Industrial	156.851	157.094	0.243	0.15%
NGV	90.219	90.462	0.243	0.27%
Non-Core				
Commerical/Industrial	102.762	103.004	0.243	0.24%
System Total	164.446	164.669	0.222	0.14%

Typical Residential Bill1	($/Month)	($/Month)	($/Month)	(%)
Non-CARE	$67.58	67.64	0.06	0.09%
CARE2	$44.91	44.91	0.00	0.00%

1. Typical residential gas customer using 24 therms per month
2. CARE customers are exempt from CARE specific programs
3. Decrease calculated comparing 2032, which is the Application gas peak year impact, to current effective rates as of 1/1/26.

	Metric	Q2 2024	Q3 2024	Q4 2024	Q1 2025[1]	Q2 2025[1]	Q3 2025[1]	Q4 2025	Q1 2026	Q2 2026	Q3 2026	Q4 2026
(h)	**ME&O dollars spent**											
h.1	Research	$0	$0	$0	$58,627	$11,494	$0	$18,923	$0	$0	$0	
h.2	Web	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	
h.3	Collateral	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,181	$4,248	$0	$100	$0	
h.4	CBOs	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$47,500	$14,833	$0	$7,500	$1,320	
h.5	Paid Media	$0	$0	$0	$0	$6,825	$13,598	$80,431	$0	$0	$39,988	
h.6	Bill Messaging	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$13,920	$0	$0	$0	$0	
h.7	Direct Communications	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$72,968	$0	$0	$0	$5	
h.8	Integrated Communications	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	
h.9	Agency Support	$0	$0	$0	$0	$68,977	$24,457	$63,304	$0	$39,988	$30,161	
h.10	Internal Labor	$7,308	$7,796	$7,673	$4,966	$21,883	$72,279	$120,561	$24,331	$32,082	$14,421	

Footnotes

[1] *Due to the timing of labor allocation updates in our accounting system, labor performed in Q1-Q3 may not be fully reflected until Q4 reporting. This occurs when adjustments or entries related to prior period activities are processed in subsequent periods, resulting in a misalignment between the actual labor timing and its recorded representation.*

	Metric	Q4 2024	Q1 2025	Q2 2025	Q3 2025	Q4 2025[1]	Q1 2026	Q2 2026	Q3 2026	Q4 2026
(a)	**Number of customers in each tier**									
a.1	Tier1 CARE					285,583	285,644	280,647	278,564	
a.2	Tier2 FERA					18,893	20,603	23,912	25,556	
a.3	Tier2 DRAH					11,334	11,347	11,428	11,712	
a.4	Tier3					1,097,087	1,098,921	1,102,449	1,105,984	
(b)	**Number of customers who change tiers**									
b.1	Changed to Tier1 (New enrollments in CARE)					13,694	14,444	11,143	13,930	
b.2	Changed to Tier2 (New Enrollments in FERA)					3,011	3,256	5,383	4,646	
b.3	Changed to Tier2 (New Enrollments in DRAH)					750	549	624	776	
b.4	Changed to Tier3 (Unenrollment in CARE/FERA/DRAH)					12,758	9,192	10,290	11,075	
(g)	**Number of related calls OR emails received[2]**									
g.1	Number of related calls				921	1,640	2,037	2,443	2,702	
g.2	Number of emails received									
(i)	**Number of customers who were asked to verify their incomes through the CARE and FERA programs**									
i.1	CARE					1,763	3,288	5,811	11,263	
i.2	FERA					4	220	230	251	
(j)	**Number of customers who successfully verified their incomes through the CARE and FERA programs**									
j.1	CARE					205	243	524	878	
j.2	FERA					1	3	4	0	

Color Coding ***Gray shading: N/A; No metrics available for this period.***

Footnotes

[1] Most Operational data will be provided starting in Q4 2025.

[2] Based on the IOU's discretion either calls **OR** emails will be reported.

Average Customer Bill Impacts

	Metric	Q4 2024	Q1 2025	Q2 2025	Q3 2025	Q4 2025[1]	Q4 2025[1]	Q1 2026	Q1 2026	Q2 2026	Q2 2026	Q3 2026	Q3 2026	Q4 2026	Q4 2026
	Rates Effective						10/1/25		1/1/26		6/1/26		8/1/26		
	Implied Volumetric Rate Reductions	**$/kWh**	**$/kWh**	**$/kWh**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**
	Residential Average Rate (Vol. Only) - With BSC						$ 0.32		$ 0.37		$0.37		$0.37		
	Residential Average Rate (Vol. Only) - Without BSC						$ 0.37		$ 0.43		$0.43		$0.43		
	Residential Average Rate - Volumetric Rate Reduction (Implied)					334	$ (0.05)	321	$ (0.06)	243	$ (0.06)	477	$ (0.06)		$ -
	Estimated Monthly Bill Impacts	**$/Month**	**$/Month**	**$/Month**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**
c.1	**Tier1 CARE[4]**							347	$ (6.36)	289	$ (4.06)	482	$ (11.73)		
	Coastal					325	$ (1.70)	312	$ (5.07)	265	$ (3.24)	406	$ (8.53)		
	Inland					394	$ (3.39)	373	$ (7.26)	308	$ (4.73)	548	$ (14.51)		
	Mountain					691	$ (11.76)	754	$ (22.98)	480	$ (10.71)	805	$ (24.64)		
	Desert					448	$ (4.71)	446	$ (9.93)	446	$ (9.62)	1,061	$ (35.99)		
c.2	**Tier2 FERA[4]**							313	$ (2.46)	265	$ 0.02	436	$ (8.49)		
	Coastal					306	$ (0.17)	287	$ (1.25)	250	$ 0.67	379	$ (5.35)		
	Inland					360	$ (2.30)	333	$ (3.39)	279	$ (0.62)	494	$ (11.57)		
	Mountain					603	$ (12.85)	584	$ (15.79)	333	$ (3.07)	716	$ (22.81)		
	Desert					474	$ (7.11)	455	$ (9.23)	429	$ (7.46)	1,021	$ (40.36)		
c.3	**Tier2 DRAH[4]**							187	$ 1.48	178	$ 2.21	280	$ (3.47)		
	Coastal					205	$ 2.10	192	$ 1.22	186	$ 1.75	281	$ (3.51)		
	Inland					188	$ 2.92	180	$ 1.88	166	$ 2.88	279	$ (3.43)		
	Mountain[2]					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
	Desert[2]					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
c.4	**Tier3[4]**							315	$ 6.32	232	$ 11.27	478	$ (3.88)		
	Coastal					328	$ 8.16	316	$ 6.28	248	$ 10.35	451	$ (2.20)		
	Inland					325	$ 8.30	312	$ 6.50	207	$ 12.65	514	$ (6.11)		
	Mountain					390	$ 5.14	421	$ 0.34	253	$ 10.09	626	$ (12.11)		
	Desert[3]					211	$ 13.85	239	$ 10.64	162	$ 15.17	552	$ (7.51)		

Changes QtoQ

	Metric	Q4 2024	Q1 2025	Q2 2025	Q3 2025		Q4 2025[1]		Q1 2026		Q2 2026		Q3 2026		Q4 2026
	Rates Effective								1/1/26		6/1/26		8/1/26		
	Implied Volumetric Rate Reductions	**$/kWh**	**$/kWh**	**$/kWh**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/kWh**
	Residential Average Rate (Vol. Only) - With BSC								$ 0.05		$ (0.00)		0.00		
	Residential Average Rate (Vol. Only) - Without BSC								$ 0.06		0.00		0.00		
	Residential Average Rate - Volumetric Rate Reduction (Implied)							(13)	$ (0.01)	(78)	0.00	234	0.00		
	Estimated Monthly Bill Impacts	**$/Month**	**$/Month**	**$/Month**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**	**Avg kWh Use**	**$/Month**
c.1	**Tier1 CARE[4]**										$ 2.30		$ (7.67)		
	Coastal								$ (3.36)		$ 1.83		$ (5.29)		
	Inland								$ (3.86)		$ 2.52		$ (9.78)		
	Mountain								$ (11.23)		$ 12.28		$ (13.93)		
	Desert								$ (5.22)		$ 0.31		$ (26.37)		
c.2	**Tier2 FERA[4]**										$ 2.47		$ (8.51)		
	Coastal								$ (1.08)		$ 1.93		$ (6.02)		
	Inland								$ (1.10)		$ 2.78		$ (10.95)		
	Mountain								$ (2.94)		$ 12.72		$ (19.74)		
	Desert								$ (2.12)		$ 1.77		$ (32.90)		
c.3	**Tier2 DRAH[4]**										$ 0.73		$ (5.68)		
	Coastal								$ (0.88)		$ 0.53		$ (5.26)		
	Inland								$ (1.04)		$ 1.00		$ (6.31)		
	Mountain[2]								N/A		N/A		N/A		
	Desert[2]								N/A		N/A		N/A		
c.4	**Tier3[4]**										$ 4.95		$ (15.15)		
	Coastal								$ (1.88)		$ 4.07		$ (12.55)		
	Inland								$ (1.80)		$ 6.15		$ (18.76)		
	Mountain								$ (4.81)		$ 9.76		$ (22.20)		
	Desert[3]								$ (3.21)		$ 4.53		$ (22.68)		

Note: Actual individual customer bills may differ materially & vary based on a variety of factors including individual usage and pricing plan. Reflects SDG&E rates effective as of 6/1/26 – Schedule TOU-DR1, SDG&E bundled residential customer, blended summer/winter bill. Delivery includes WF-NBC. CARE & FERA scenarios reflect applicable discounts & exemptions. Excludes certain fees & CA Climate Credit. Figures may not sum due to rounding.

Color Coding ***Gray shading: N/A; No metrics available for this period.***

Footnotes

[1] SDG&E implemented the residential BSC in rates on 10/1/25. As result, Q4-25 represents the first iteration of the BSC quarterly report for average customer bill impacts.

[2] SDG&E does not have any active residental customers enrolled in the Deed Restricted Affordable Housing (DRAH) program within the Mountain and Desert climate zones.

[3] ~0.2% of SDG&E's residential customers reside in the Desert climate zone.

[4] Tier Average Bills are calcuated by weighting the climate zone bills by the population distribution of the climate zones.

		Q3 2025			Q4 2025			Q1 2026			Q2 2026			Q3 2026		
	Metric	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep
(Res1[1])	**Number of visits to dedicated website**	945	15,327	14,090	9,756	11,395	21,099	5,824	1,410	1294	1180	1096	322	1,104	1,292	1,232
(d)	**Number of press article mentions**	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(e)	**Impressions and reach of paid media**		20,819	1,901,114	809,946	1,524,378	1,685,589	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451,388
(f)	**Number and type of outbound targeted communications and bill messages**															
	Direct Mail - Sent															
f.1	Tier1 CARE		23,115	22,834												
f.2	Tier2 FERA		605	600												
f.3	Tier2 DRAH		1,000	8,852												72
f.4	Tier3		61,873	63,418												
f.5	All Tiers															
f.5.1	Multi accounts		15,606	13,228												
f.5.2	Master meter		539	535												
	Email Communications															
f.1	Tier1 CARE - Sent		228,263	225,933												
f.1.1[1]	Tier1 CARE - Open rate		68.6%	67.9%												
f.1.2[1]	Tier1 CARE - Click-through rate		1.3%	1.3%												
f.2	Tier2 FERA - Sent		14,809	14,161												
f.2.1[1]	Tier2 FERA - Open rate		65%	69.3%												
f.2.2[1]	Tier2 FERA - Click-through rate		1.1%	1.3%												
f.3	Tier2 DRAH - Sent		13,620	13,630												1,055
f.3.1[1]	Tier2 DRAH - Open rate		71.5%	70%												76%
f.3.2[1]	Tier2 DRAH - Click-through rate		1.8%	5.2%												6.80%
f.4	Tier3 - Sent		737,110	740,216												
f.4.1[1]	Tier3 - Open rate		74.6%	74.2%												
f.4.2[1]	Tier3 - Click-through rate		0.9%	0.8%												
f.5	All Tiers															
f.5.1	Multi accounts - Sent		46,971	46,258												
f.5.1.1[1]	Multi accounts - Open rates		67.8%	67.8%												
f.5.1.2[1]	Multi accounts - Click-through rates		0.6%	0.9%												
f.5.2[2]	Master meter - Sent															
f.5.2.1	Master meter - Open rates															
f.5.2.2	Master meter - Click-through rates															
f.6	Bill Message															
f.6.1	On Bill Message			1,036,185	1,254,460											
f.6.2	Bill Insert			542,061												
f.6.3	Bill Onsert			1,036,185	1,254,460											
f.6.4	Envelope															

Color Coding

Gray shading: N/A; No metrics available for this period.

Footnotes

[1] Number of visits to dedicated website and Email Open & Click-through rate metrics

[2] Master-meter customers were sent direct mail communications only.