ALJ/RAB/fs

Decision 89 06 049 JUN 21 1989

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of the SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338 E) for: (1) Authority to increase its Energy Cost Adjustment Billing Factors and increase its Electric Revenue Adjustment Billing Factor effective July 1, 1989; and (2) Authority to terminate its Conservation Load Management Adjustment Clause effective July 1, 1989, as more specifically set forth in this application.	Application 89-03-023 (Filed March 17, 1989)

ORIGINAL

(See Appendix A for appearances.)

O P I N I O N

In Decision (D.) 83-02-076, we authorized utilities to file at least one, and possibly two Energy Cost Adjustment Clause (ECAC) filings a year. One filing was an annual filing but the other was to be filed when the utility forecast that the revenue required to amortize its ECAC balancing account plus projected energy costs differed by ± 5% from authorized revenue. This is known as a trigger filing.

Southern California Edison Company (Edison), in compliance with the trigger filing requirements, filed on March 17, 1989 to increase its rates effective for service rendered on and after July 1, 1989, by $351.3 million or 5.7% on an annualized basis. This net increase in rate levels was comprised of a $434.5 million increase in the Average Energy Cost Adjustment Rate (AECAR); a $100.6 million decrease in the Electric Revenue

Adjustment Billing Factor (ERABF); and a $17.4 million increase due to the termination of the Conservation Load Management Adjustment Clause (CLMAC).

The Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) responded with a study which showed that Edison should decrease its rates by $65.4 million. In tabular form the comparison is:

1989 - 1990 Forecast Year
(Millions of Dollars)

	Edison	DRA	Difference
ECAC	$434.5	$233.4	$(201.1)
ERAM	(100.6)	(298.8)	(198.2)
CLMAC	17.4	0	(17.4)
Total	351.3	(65.4)	(416.7)

Public hearing was held before Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Robert Barnett. During the hearing, the DRA and Edison agreed on a common method to estimate the forecast year revenue requirements and agreed on the forecast year proposed revenue increase. The revised estimates occurred as a result of agreement on recomputing base rates and ERAM billing factors using more recent numbers and sales forecast, eliminating the CLMAC from this proceeding, and updating gas and coal cost estimates.

Agreed Proposed Revenue Increase 1989-1990 Forecast Year
(Millions of Dollars)

		Percent Increase
ECAC	$416.6	6.7%
ERAM	(151.7)	(2.4)
CLMAC	0.0	0
Base Rates	(114.3)	(1.8)
Total Increase	$150.6	2.4%

The concerns of the interested parties centered on three principal issues: (1) whether the Commission should authorize an increase when the overall increase in rates was shown to be less

than 5% of gross revenue, (2) whether the method of computing the increase could be altered from that used in past proceedings, and (3) whether revenue allocation and rate design should differ from that used in past proceedings. Prior to the hearing the DRA moved to dismiss because its analysis showed an ECAC increase of less than 5%, which is below the 5% threshold for the trigger filing. The ALJ denied the motion on the ground that it was based on allegations which showed a conflict in the evidence which required a hearing. The ALJ reserved the issue for briefing at the end of the hearing should the evidence show less than ± 5% revenue change.

Toward Utility Rate Normalization (TURN) moved to exclude revenue allocation as an issue and to substitute a simple equal percentage change for all classes. This motion was opposed by Edison, the DRA, the California Large Energy Consumers Association, and others. Those in opposition desired to move further along the path toward an Equal Percentage of Marginal Cost (EPMC) revenue allocation. In denying TURN's motion, the ALJ observed that Edison proposed an allocation closer to EPMC than that found reasonable in Edison's last ECAC case, that the DRA differed with Edison in regard to marginal energy costs, that other parties had conflicting views on rate design, and that TURN opposed any EPMC in a trigger filing, with the consequence that to litigate this issue would consume more time than the five days allotted for hearing. The ALJ ruled that the revenue allocation and rate design authorized in Edison's last ECAC decision would be used in this application.

The Cogenerators of Southern California, a group representing qualifying facilities (QF's), moved to exclude avoided cost issues. This motion was denied on the ground that the moving party made no showing that avoided costs would be an issue in this proceeding. Edison moved for summary judgment regarding forecast expense for certain nonstandard QF contracts. The ALJ denied this motion on the ground that all forecasts were at issue, but held that the reasonableness of QF contracts would not be at issue. The

California Manufacturers Association and the Federal Executive Agencies expressed concern over rate design to which the ALJ ruled that rate design would follow the method used in Edison's last ECAC and would not be at issue in this proceeding.

With the motions decided on the basis that the methodology approved by the Commission in Edison's last ECAC would be followed the concerns of most of the interested parties abated and the hearing was limited to explaining and reducing the differences between Edison's forecast and that of the DRA. These differences were resolved in a series of off-the-record negotiations, to which all parties were invited. The end result was agreement between Edison and DRA that the net impact of forecast changes for the 1989-1990 Forecast Year was a $150,600,000, or 2.4% revenue increase.

Discussion

We affirm the rulings of the presiding ALJ.

In D.83-02-076 (10 CPUC 734), we first authorized a trigger filing and explained our concerns and expectations. Prior to that decision the major electric utilities in California each had three ECAC hearings a year which resulted in frequent rate revisions. We sought to guard against significant over- or undercollections of energy expenses. But we also sought ease of administration and rate stability. Our experience was that frequent rate hearings and revisions strained the ability of our staff to assign sufficient personnel to each offset application. We were also concerned with rate stability. We weighed the effect of frequent rate changes, which is reduction in wide swings in rates, with that of less frequent changes, which would allow ratepayers to plan their energy uses and costs. Further, stability for its own sake is a benefit. We chose stability by reducing the frequency of ECAC hearings. We found that by reducing the ECAC proceedings from three to two and making one of them subject to a trigger mechanism, we would simplify administration,

further the goal of rate stability, provide timely and accurate price signals to customers, and minimize the possibility of abrupt changes in rates. (10 CPUC at 760.)

D.83-02-076 did not, however, answer all questions. Petitions for modification were filed which resulted in D.83-11-019, a clarification of the ECAC procedure. Our concern today is with Conclusions of Law 8 and 9 of that decision:

> "8. ERAM revenues should not be included in the ECAC revenue adjustment used to determine whether the semiannual ECAC filing is triggered.
>
> "9. If an ECAC filing is triggered, an ERAM adjustment should also be filed."

D.83-11-019 did not discuss reasons for reaching Conclusions 8 and 9 other than to say that the conclusions were agreed to by the staff and the utility. (Sheet 3 of D.83-11-019.) As a matter of course in ECAC proceedings we consider the effect of the ERAM on rates to be authorized. Ratepayers pay dollars for electricity; not ECAC dollars nor ERAM dollars. With rate stability and ease of administration as our goal it makes no sense to differentiate between ECAC dollars and ERAM dollars. It is the net result that counts.

In D.89-01-040, we established the hearing schedule for Edison's trigger filing (if the threshold ± 5% were met) as follows: trigger filing, March 19; trigger DRA report, April 18; trigger prehearing conference, April 23; trigger hearings begin April 28; trigger hearings end, May 2; and draft ALJ trigger decision due, May 16. The Commission expects its final decision to be signed in late June with a July 1 effective date. By allotting only five days for hearing and two weeks (10 working days) to draft a decision, it would be imprudent to litigate issues other than determining whether the ± 5% is accurate. The trigger schedule of 18 days between first day of hearing and ALJ decision should be

compared with the regular annual ECAC schedule of 76 days between first day of hearing and ALJ decision.

We conclude from our review of our reasons for reducing the ECAC procedures from three to two annually, for providing a trigger which might obviate one of those hearings, and for providing only 18 days for hearing and ALJ decision in a trigger proceeding that the issues in a trigger filing should be as few as possible.

The presiding ALJ ruled correctly when he refused to consider modifications to the method of achieving revenue allocation and rate design which we approved in Edison's last ECAC decision. Nor should a trigger ECAC consider reasonableness reviews, avoided cost issues, marginal energy cost methodology, or any issue that is time consuming or better heard within the broad scope of a regular ECAC proceeding, which for Edison began May 30, 1989 with the filing of A.89-05-064.

At the hearing there was also discussed a modification of the base rate revenue estimate which shows an expected $114 million overcollection in the forecast year, due to increased sales. Although this modification was incorporated into the revenue requirement agreement between Edison and the DRA, Edison argues that we should not order this and other changes in all trigger filings. We will accept Edison's argument.

No change to Edison's Annual Energy Rate (AER) is needed because by D.89-01-040 the AER is suspended through the end of 1989. Even if the AER were not suspended, rate decisions in response to trigger applications do not change the AER. In A.84-11-054, a trigger filing by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, we stated, "In accordance with D.83-02-076 and D.83-11-019 the AER will not change as a result of this filing." (Sheet 3 of D.85-04-004.)

Coincident with rate changes sought in this application Edison has requested that rate changes be authorized for four other

revenue elements: Balsam Meadows (adopted in D.89-06-012); Devers Valley-Serrano (adopted in D.89-04-042); Sylmar-Pacific HVDC Intertie Expansion (by Advice Letter 834-E, filed May 5, 1989); and elimination of the CLMAC (by Advice Letter 835-E, filed May 16, 1989. The revenue requirement to cover these four revenue elements in the forecast period 1989-1990 is estimated to be $50.6 million. Edison has requested that this recovery be included in rates to be effective July 1, 1989, but if the trigger ECAC is not allowed then Edison requests that this $50.6 million cost be placed in balancing accounts instead. The effect of Edison's proposal is that if we agree to permit the 2.4% trigger increase to go into effect that will trigger an additional $50.6 million rate increase for an overall increase of $201.2 million, or 3.25% over present rate revenues. Despite the actual effect of our order being an increase in rates of 3.25%, that is still substantially below the ± 5% trigger limitation for filing of the application. Appendix B shows the composition of the 3.25% increase. By removing the four elements discussed above the increase would be 2.4% or $150,600,000.

Conclusion of Law 2 in D.83-02-076 makes clear our ongoing intention that the ±5% trigger limits apply only to the utility filing of a trigger application, without restriction of our options to grant or deny a rate change, and whether the adopted change is outside the ±5% range or not. However, we will continue to be guided by the policy considerations addressed in OII 82-09-02, which are the need for rate stability, the need for frequent rate revisions to guard against significant over- and undercollections in balancing accounts, the provision of timely price signals to consumers, and the burdens on staff of litigating frequent rate applications.

In balancing the needs for rate stability, minimization of balancing account over- and undercollections, and timely price

signals for consumers, it is reasonable to grant a rate increase effective July 1, 1989.

Our consideration of rate stability includes looking forward to possible rate changes in the future. Edison has already filed for a regular ECAC increase to become effective January 1, 1990, and we anticipate a request for an attrition rate change effective the same date. As well, previously deferred revenue requirements associated with Edison's share of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station are due in the first month of 1990. Without prejudging the revenue impacts of those proceedings, we should not overlook future revenue increases. Nor can we ignore further movement toward EPMC, which might magnify rate changes to residential customers. Although the present request is for only a 3.25% increase, deferral of that amount may make future increases more difficult for customers to manage.

Granting an increase now will help implement our policy of moving rates toward EPMC. The residential electric rates of Pacific Gas and Electric Company and San Diego Gas and Electric Company have already reached 100% of EPMC. It may take several steps for Edison to also reach EPMC, and this increase will make progress toward that goal.

Granting an increase will alleviate larger over- and undercollections in Edison's ECAC and ERAM balancing account, giving ratepayers a clearer picture of current utility costs of service. By coordinating the increase with the four other revenue changes discussed above, we also avoid the special balancing account treatment sought by Edison in the event the trigger increase is denied.

Having decided to authorize the $201.2 million increase, we must determine how the increase shall be allocated to customers. Because this expedited proceeding did not allow litigation of revenue allocation we will adopt the same allocation scheme used in D.88-09-031 in Edison's last ECAC case. The allocation is based on

2/3 System Average Percent Change (SAPC) and 1/3 EPMC, with a 2.5% cap over SAPC. The adopted allocation is shown in Appendix C to this decision.

Comments to ALJ Proposed Decision

This decision was issued as a Proposed Decision, and comments were received from Edison, the DRA, the Industrial Users, and the California Farm Bureau Federation. Edison requested that the increase be permitted to go into effect; the other three commenting parties support the denial of the increase. Based on Edison's comments on the Proposed Decision's attempt to modify the trigger mechanism aurhorized in D.83-11-019, we have deleted the modifying language, but this has no impact on the end result.

Findings of Fact

1. Edison's present rate revenue for forecast year July 1, 1989 - June 30, 1990 is $6,182,000,000.

2. In its application Edison alleged that its ECAC revenue for the forecast year would be undercollected by approximately $435 million, which is more than 5% greater than its forecast year present rate revenue.

3. In the forecast year ECAC rates are expected to be undercollected by $416.6 million, base rates overcollected by $114.3 million and ERAM rates overcollected by $151.7 million for a net undercollection of $150.6 million, or 2.4% of revenues at present rates.

4. Granting of this application would also increase forecast year revenues by an additional $50.6 million to provide for the costs of Balsam Meadows, Devers Valley-Serrano, Sylmar-Pacific HVDC Intertie Expansion, and elimination of the CLMAC, thereby making the net rate increase 3.25% of present rate revenue.

5. Edison and DRA agree that if an increase is granted the amount should be $201.2 million and the increase should become effective July 1, 1989.

6. Authorization of a July 1, 1989 increase (1) may moderate a larger increase in A.89-05-064, Edison's next scheduled ECAC case, and other proceedings; (2) would move Edison's residential rates closer to EPMC; (3) may reduce ECAC and ERAM over- or undercollections; (4) would move Edison's rates closer to actual current costs; and (5) would coordinate the requested rate changes with changes authorized in other proceedings.

7. Use of the revenue allocation scheme adopted in Edison's last ECAC application is reasonable.

Conclusions of Law

1. Edison has met its ECAC trigger filing obligation by filing of this application.

2. Authorization of a trigger rate change where the adopted change is less than ±5% is at the Commission's discretion.

3. The relief requested in the application, as modified by the revenue agreement between Edison and the DRA, should be granted.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Southern California Edison Company shall file revised tariff sheets to reflect the revenue changes shown in Appendix B and the rates shown in Appendix C to this decision.

2. The revised tariff sheets shall conform to General Order 96-A, shall be marked to show that they were authorized by this decision and shall become effective three (3) days after the date filed, but no sooner than July 1, 1989. The revised tariffs shall apply only to service on or after their effective date.

3. This order is effective today.

Dated June 21, 1989, at San Francisco, California.

G. MITCHELL WILK
President
FREDERICK R. DUDA
STANLEY W. HULETT
JOHN B. OHANIAN
PATRICIA M. ECKERT
Commissioners

I CERTIFY THAT THIS DECISION WAS APPROVED BY THE ABOVE COMMISSIONERS TODAY.

Victor Weisser, Executive Director

APPENDIX A

List of Appearances

Applicant: Richard K. Durant, Frank J. Cooley, and Bruce A. Reed, Attorneys at Law, for Southern California Edison Company.

Interested Parties: Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler, by Michael Alcantar, Attorney at Law, for Cogenerators of Southern California; Barkovich & Yap, by Barbara R. Barkovich, and Jackson, Tufts, Cole & Black, by William M. Booth, Joseph S. Faber, and Evelyn K. McCormish, Attorneys at Law, for California Large Energy Consumers Association; Morrison & Foerster, by Jerry R. Bloom, Attorney at Law, for California Cogeneration Council; Matthew V. Brady, Attorney at Law, and Law offices of Dian M. Grueneich, by Barry Epstein, Attorney at Law, for California Department of General Services; Chester & Schmidt Consultants, by Thomas L. Chester, for California City-County Streetlighting Association; Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison, by Gordon E. Davis, Attorney at Law, for California Manufacturers Association; Michael Ferguson, Richard Baish, and Randolph L. Wu, Attorneys at Law, for El Paso Natural Gas Company; Michel Peter Florio and Joel Singer, Attorneys at Law, for Toward Utility Rate Normalization (TURN); Norman J. Furuta, Attorney at Law, for Federal Executive Agencies; Paul J. Kaufman, Attorney at Law, for Kern River Cogeneration Company; Thomas J. Knobloch, for Drazen-Brubaker & Associates, Inc.; Sharon K. Matsumura, Attorney at Law, for Federal Executive Agencies; A. Kirk McKenzie, Attorney at Law, for California Energy Commission; Karen Norene Mills, Attorney at Law, for California Farm Bureau Federation; Donald Salow, for Association of California Water Agencies; Donald W. Schoenbeck, for Regulatory and Cogeneration Services, Inc.; Armour, St. John, Wilcox, Goodin & Schlotz, by James D. Squeri, Attorney at Law, for Kelco Division of Merck Company, Inc.; Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, by Philip A. Stohr, Attorney at Law, for Industrial Users; Nancy Thompson, for Barakat, Howard & Chamberlin; Robert B. Weisenmiller, for Morse, Richard, Weisenmiller & Associates; and Harry K. Winters, for Regents, University of California.

Commission Advisory and Compliance Division: Ali Miremadi

Division of Ratepayer Advocates: Catherine Johnson, Attorney at Law, Bill Y. Lee, and Donald J. Lafrenz.

(END OF APPENDIX A)

APPENDIX B

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
CONSOLIDATION OF REVENUE REQUIREMENTS
Forecast Period: July 1, 1989 thru June 30, 1990
Effective date: July 1, 1989

REVENUE ELEMENT	PRESENT RATE REVENUE 6/ (000's of $)	REVENUE CHANGE (000's of $)	ADOPTED REVENUE REQUIREMENT 4/6/ (000's of $)	AVERAGE RATE (cents/Kwh)	5/
Base rates					
Previously authorized base rates	$3,633,492.3	($114,317.9)	$3,519,174.4	5.246	
Transfer of Devers-Valley-Serrano to base rates	0.0	22,876.8	22,876.8	0.034	1/
Transfer of Balsam Meadow to base rates	0.0	44,345.9	44,345.9	0.066	2/
Subtotal base rate revenues	$3,633,492.3	($47,095.2)	$3,586,397.1	5.346	
Major Additions Adjustment Clause (MAAC)					
SONGS 2 and 3 post-COD	44,275.1	0.0	44,275.1	0.066	
Balsam Meadow	36,896.0	(28,845.9)	8,050.0	0.012	
Devers-Valley-Serrano	20,125.1	(16,770.9)	3,354.2	0.005	
High Voltage DC Transmission line	0.0	11,404.2	11,404.2	0.017	3/
SONGS pre-COD balancing account	8,050.0	0.0	8,050.0	0.012	
Subtotal MAAC rate revenues	$109,346.2	($34,212.6)	$75,133.6	0.112	
Energy Cost Adjustment Clause (ECAC)					
Fuel and purchased power	2,244,558.0	297,296.2	2,541,854.2	3.789	
Balancing account	(2,012.5)	119,408.7	117,396.2	0.175	
LSFO writedown	54,337.7	0.0	54,337.7	0.081	
Distillate writedown	4,695.8	0.0	4,695.8	0.007	
Chevron settlement	207,288.2	0.0	207,288.2	0.309	
Subtotal ECAC rate revenues	$2,508,867.2	$416,704.9	$2,925,572.1	4.361	
Annual Energy Rate	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	0.000	
Electric Revenue Adjustment Billing Factor	($52,325.2)	($151,608.8)	($203,934.0)	(0.304)	
Conservation Load Management Adj. Clause (CLMAC)	($17,441.7)	$17,441.7	$0.0	0.000	3/
SUBTOTAL	$6,181,938.8	$201,230.0	$6,383,168.8	9.515	
PERCENTAGE INCREASE		3.26%			
Other Operating Revenue	57,547.0	0.0	57,547.0		
CPUC fees	8,050.0	0.0	8,050.0	0.012	
TOTAL	$6,247,535.8	$201,230.0	$6,448,765.8		

1/ Adopted in D.89-04-042.
2/ Adopted in D.89-06-012.
3/ Edison's estimate. Advice Letter filing anticipated.
4/ Includes FF&U at 0.944% which translates to a factor of 1.00953.
5/ Computed at an adjusted annual sales of 67,083.6 Gwh which excludes employee discounts.
6/ Excludes Fringe and Sequoia.

(END APPENDIX B)

APPENDIX C

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

REVENUE ALLOCATION AND RATE DESIGN

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY ECAC
ADOPTED REVENUE ALLOCATION 1/
Forecast period: July 1, 1989 thru June 30, 1990

CUSTOMER GROUP	SALES 2/ (GWH)	PRESENT RATE REV 3/ ($000's)	TOTAL MC REVS 4/ ($000's)	FULL EPMC ($000's)	(%) INC.	SAPC ($000's)	(%) INC.	ADOPTED CHANGES 2/3 SAPC 1/3 EPMC 2.5% CAP OVER SAPC 5/ ($000's)	(%) TOTAL INC.	AVERAGE RATE ($/KWH)
DOMESTIC	20,766	2,006,071	1,659,700	2,257,554	12.5	2,071,736	3.3	2,121,867	5.8	0.102
SM/MED POWER										
GS-1	4,243	492,573	367,500	499,698	1.4	508,703	3.3	507,251	3.0	0.120
GS-2	18,069	1,735,232	1,283,300	1,744,994	0.6	1,792,053	3.3	1,781,657	2.7	0.099
LARGE POWER										
TOU-8:2ND	8,848	751,811	543,300	738,738	(1.7)	776,430	3.3	765,967	1.9	0.087
TOU-8:PRI	8,425	647,181	478,000	649,948	0.4	668,374	3.3	664,195	2.6	0.079
TOU-8:SUB	4,245	275,145	177,200	240,943	(12.4)	284,155	3.3	270,195	(1.8)	0.064
AGRICULTURE	2,029	199,865	137,600	187,229	(6.3)	206,406	3.3	200,470	0.3	0.099
STREETLIGHTING	489	74,063	20,700	64,065	(13.5)	75,312	1.7	71,566	(3.4)	0.146
TOTAL	67,113	6,181,941	4,667,300	6,383,169	3.3	6,383,169	3.3	6,383,169	3.3	0.095

1/ Although facilities charges and optional TOU meter charges have been excluded from the revenue allocation process, these amounts have been added to the figures in this table in order to obtain the correct percentage increases and average rate calculations. Facilities charges and TOU meter charges are expressed in thousands for the following classes: $820.8 for domestic; $61.2 for GS-2; $130.6 for agriculture; $35,918.7 for streetlighting.

2/ ECAC sales figures have not been adjusted for employee discounts; fringe and Sequoia sales have been excluded.

3/ Present rate revenues are adjusted for the large power class to reflect the difference between actual interruptible credits and credits allocated on an EPMC basis.

4/ Based on marginal costs from SCE general rate case D.87-12-066. Marginal cost revenue responsibility has been updated for ECAC forecast sales, demand and customers.

5/ Interruptible credits are computed on an EPMC basis, based on D.87-12-066 as modified. Revenue deficiency from capping is spread to other classes on a 2/3 SAPC, 1/3 EPMC basis.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL RATES

EFFECTIVE 7-01-89
($/KWH)

SCHEDULE	D	TOU-D	
SEASON	ANNUAL	SUMMER	WINTER
MINIMUM BASE RATE CHARGE ($/DAY)	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
a/			
TIER 1 ENERGY RATE	$0.08453	--	--
TIER 2 ENERGY RATE	$0.12832	--	--
ON-PEAK ENERGY RATE	--	$0.44455	--
MID-PEAK ENERGY RATE	--	$0.17141	$0.13927
OFF-PEAK ENERGY RATE	--	$0.07321	$0.07321
b/			
TOU-D BASELINE CREDIT	--	$0.04429	$0.04429
METER CHARGE ($/DAY)	--	$0.15	$0.15

a/ The Tier 1 energy rate (Baseline) is 88.75% of the System Average Rate (SAR), where the SAR is total revenue requirement from sales divided by total sales ($6,383.146 MM / 67,113.0 MMKWH = 0.09511 $/KWH).

b/ TOU-D energy rates are reduced by baseline credit for an amount equal to their otherwise applicable baseline allowance, but no more than their actual kwh usage.

APPENDIX C
PAGE 3
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED SMALL AND MEDIUM POWER RATES

EFFECTIVE 7-01-89
($/KWH)

SCHEDULE	GS-SP/TP	TC-1	GS-2	
SEASON	ANNUAL	ANNUAL	SUMMER	WINTER
CUSTOMER CHARGE	$0.30/DAY	$0.30/DAY	$33.20/MONTH	$33.20/MONTH
DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	--	--	$9.20	$2.90
TIER 1 ENERGY RATE (FIRST 300 KWH PER KW)	--	--	$0.08675	$0.08675
TIER 2 ENERGY RATE (EXCESS)	--	--	$0.05012	$0.05012
FLAT ENERGY RATE	$0.11048	$0.09591	--	--

NOTE:

GS-TP: limited to existing GS-1 three phase customers at present and to be phased out by 12/31/90. Thereafter, these three phase customers will be assigned to GS-2, TOU-GS, PA-1 or PA-2 based on operational characteristics.

APPENDIX C
PAGE 4

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED SMALL AND MEDIUM POWER TIME-OF-USE RATES

EFFECTIVE 7-01-89
($/KWH)

SCHEDULE	TOU-GS		TOU-GS-SOP		
SEASON	SUMMER	WINTER	SUMMER	SPRING/FALL	WINTER
CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$33.20	$33.20	$33.20	$33.20	$33.20
TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH):					
ON-PEAK	$12.55	--	$36.50	--	--
MID-PEAK	$1.95	--	$1.00	$0.50	$0.50
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$2.90	$2.90	$2.90	$2.90	$2.90
ON-PEAK ENERGY RATE	$0.12340	--	$0.10370	--	--
MID-PEAK ENERGY RATE	$0.09986	$0.11219	$0.10370	$0.07851	$0.08626
OFF-PEAK ENERGY RATE	$0.05012	$0.05012	$0.06831	$0.07293	$0.07293
SUPER OFF-PEAK ENERGY RATE	--	--	$0.03512	$0.03512	$0.03512
METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00

APPENDIX C
PAGE 5
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED LARGE POWER RATES

EFFECTIVE 7-01-89
($/KWH)

SCHEDULE	TOU-8			TOU-8-SOP		
VOLTAGE	SECONDARY	PRIMARY	SUBTRANS	SECONDARY	PRIMARY	SUBTRANS
CUSTOMER CHARGE	$272.85	$272.15	$262.00	$272.85	$272.15	$262.00
TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)						
SUMMER ON-PEAK	$14.45	$14.15	$11.75	$36.00	$35.90	$33.00
SUMMER MID-PEAK	$2.25	$2.15	$1.85	$0.95	$0.95	$0.90
SPRING/FALL MID-PEAK	--	--	--	$0.50	$0.50	$0.45
WINTER MID-PEAK	--	--	--	$0.50	$0.50	$0.45
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$2.95	$2.15	$0.25	$2.95	$2.15	$0.25
SUMMER ENERGY CHARGE:						
ON-PEAK	$0.11000	$0.10216	$0.07612	$0.10164	$0.08950	$0.07296
MID-PEAK	$0.08902	$0.08268	$0.06161	$0.10164	$0.08950	$0.07296
OFF-PEAK	$0.05012	$0.05012	$0.05012	$0.06692	$0.05909	$0.04831
SUPER OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	$0.03512	$0.03512	$0.03512
SPRING/FALL ENERGY CHARGE:						
ON-PEAK	--	--	--	--	--	--
MID-PEAK	--	--	--	$0.07691	$0.06791	$0.05551
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	$0.07141	$0.06306	$0.05155
SUPER OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	$0.03512	$0.03512	$0.03512
WINTER ENERGY CHARGE:						
MID-PEAK	$0.10001	$0.09288	$0.06921	$0.08459	$0.07468	$0.06106
OFF-PEAK	$0.05012	$0.05012	$0.05012	$0.07141	$0.06306	$0.05155
SUPER OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	$0.03512	$0.03512	$0.03512
RATE LIMITER:						
AVERAGE SUMMER	$0.12561	$0.12561	--	--	--	--
SUMMER ON-PEAK	$0.78790	$0.78255	$0.57493	--	--	--

APPENDIX C
PAGE 6
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED LARGE POWER INTERRUPTIBLE RATES

EFFECTIVE 7-01-89
($/KWH)

SCHEDULE	TOU-8-SOP-I-A			TOU-8-SOP-I-B		
VOLTAGE	SECONDARY	PRIMARY	SUBTRANS	SECONDARY	PRIMARY	SUBTRANS
CUSTOMER CHARGE	$272.85	$272.15	$262.00	$272.85	$272.15	$262.00
TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)						
SUMMER ON-PEAK	$25.20	$25.10	$22.65	$26.50	$26.40	$24.00
SUMMER MID-PEAK	$0.60	$0.60	$0.60	$0.65	$0.65	$0.65
SPRING/FALL MID-PEAK	$0.35	$0.35	$0.30	$0.35	$0.35	$0.30
WINTER MID-PEAK	$0.35	$0.35	$0.30	$0.35	$0.35	$0.30
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$2.95	$2.15	$0.25	$2.95	$2.15	$0.25
SUMMER ENERGY CHARGE:						
ON-PEAK	$0.98180	$0.08709	$0.07066	$0.09860	$0.08739	$0.07095
MID-PEAK	$0.98180	$0.08709	$0.07066	$0.09860	$0.08739	$0.07095
OFF-PEAK	$0.06380	$0.05701	$0.04632	$0.06418	$0.05727	$0.04657
SUPER OFF-PEAK	$0.03355	$0.03355	$0.03355	$0.03374	$0.03374	$0.03374
SPRING/FALL ENERGY CHARGE:						
ON-PEAK	--	--	--	--	--	--
MID-PEAK	$0.07471	$0.06578	$0.05347	$0.07498	$0.06604	$0.05372
OFF-PEAK	$0.06910	$0.06082	$0.04941	$0.06938	$0.06110	$0.04968
SUPER OFF-PEAK	$0.03355	$0.03355	$0.03355	$0.03374	$0.03374	$0.03374
WINTER ENERGY CHARGE:						
MID-PEAK	$0.08235	$0.07250	$0.05898	$0.08263	$0.07277	$0.05924
OFF-PEAK	$0.06919	$0.06091	$0.04949	$0.06946	$0.06117	$0.04975
SUPER OFF-PEAK	$0.03355	$0.03355	$0.03355	$0.03374	$0.03374	$0.03374

APPENDIX C
PAGE 7
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED LARGE POWER INTERRUPTIBLE RATES

EFFECTIVE 7-01-89
($/KWH)

SCHEDULE	I-5-A			I-5-B		
VOLTAGE	SECONDARY	PRIMARY	SUBTRANS	SECONDARY	PRIMARY	SUBTRANS
CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$272.85	$272.15	$262.00	$272.85	$272.15	$262.00
TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)						
SUMMER ON-PEAK	$14.45	$14.15	$11.75	$14.45	$14.15	$11.75
SUMMER MID-PEAK	$2.25	$2.15	$1.85	$2.25	$2.15	$1.85
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$2.95	$2.15	$0.25	$2.95	$2.15	$0.25
SUMMER ENERGY CHARGE:						
ON-PEAK	$0.09500	$0.08716	$0.06112	$0.11000	$0.10216	$0.07612
MID-PEAK	$0.07402	$0.06768	$0.04661	$0.08902	$0.08268	$0.06161
OFF-PEAK (TIER 1)	$0.02512	$0.02512	$0.02512	$0.05012	$0.05012	$0.05012
OFF-PEAK (TIER 2)	--	--	--	$0.02512	$0.02512	$0.02512
WINTER ENERGY CHARGE:						
MID-PEAK	$0.08501	$0.07788	$0.05421	$0.10001	$0.09288	$0.06921
OFF-PEAK (TIER 1) a/	$0.02512	$0.02512	$0.02512	$0.05012	$0.05012	$0.05012
OFF-PEAK (TIER 2) a/	--	--	--	$0.02512	$0.02512	$0.02512

OTHER SCHEDULES:

		Adopted Credit ($/kW/SUMMER mo)
I-1:	Rate A	$8.10
	Rate B	$6.70
I-2:	Rate A	$8.30
	Rate B	$6.90
I-3:	Rate A (Energy Credit)	$2.50
	Rate B	$5.30
	Rate C	$4.00
	Rate D	$2.70
I-5:	Rate A (Energy Credit)	
	Rate B (Energy Credit)	

Note: I-5A rates equal TOU-8 rates minus 1.5 c/kwh for on-peak and mid-peak energy, and minus 2.5 c/kwh for off-peak energy.

I-5B rates equal TOU-8 rates, except off-peak kwh beyond 300 kwh/kw of the Firm Service Level equal TOU-8 off-peak energy rates minus 2.5 c/kwh.

a/ See pp. 337-338 of D. 87-12-066 for note on off-peak rate floor.

APPENDIX C
PAGE 8
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED LARGE POWER INTERRUPTIBLE RATES

EFFECTIVE 7-01-89
($/KWH)

SCHEDULE	I-6 A			I-6 B		
VOLTAGE	SECONDARY	PRIMARY	SUBTRANS	SECONDARY	PRIMARY	SUBTRANS
CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$272.85	$272.15	$262.00	$272.85	$272.15	$262.00
TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)						
SUMMER ON-PEAK	$9.90	$9.75	$7.50	$10.45	$10.30	$8.05
SUMMER MID-PEAK	$1.55	$1.45	$1.20	$1.65	$1.55	$1.25
SPRING/FALL MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	--	--
WINTER MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	--	--
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$2.95	$2.15	$0.25	$2.95	$2.15	$0.25
SUMMER ENERGY CHARGE:						
ON-PEAK	$0.10302	$0.09533	$0.06985	$0.10389	$0.09618	$0.07063
MID-PEAK	$0.08362	$0.07738	$0.05680	$0.08429	$0.07804	$0.05739
OFF-PEAK	$0.04554	$0.04554	$0.04554	$0.04611	$0.04611	$0.04611
SUPER OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	--	--
WINTER ENERGY CHARGE:						
MID-PEAK	$0.09438	$0.08751	$0.06426	$0.09508	$0.08818	$0.06487
OFF-PEAK	$0.04538	$0.04538	$0.04538	$0.04597	$0.04597	$0.04597
SUPER OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	--	--

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED STANDBY RATES

SCHEDULE S

RATES

Standby charge:	Service Voltage	Per meter Per month
All kW of standby demand, per kW	Below 2 kV	$2.95
All kW of standby demand, per kW	2 kV to 50 kV	$2.15
All kW of standby demand, per kW	Above 50 kV	$0.25

APPENDIX C
PAGE 10
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL RATES
EFFECTIVE 7-01-89

RATE SCHEDULE	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW OR HP) SUMMER	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW OR HP) WINTER	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH) TIER 1	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH) TIER 2
PA-2	$21.85	--	$7.80	$1.25	0.09588	0.05012

					SUMMER	WINTER
PA-1	$10.95	--	$1.10	$1.10	0.08870	0.08870
TOU-PA-1	$10.95	--	$3.00	$3.00	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.09687	0.09869
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.05999	0.06459
TOU-ALMP-2	$10.95	--	--	--	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.22418	0.21823
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.07242	0.07641
TOU-PA: Rate A	$32.80	$6.00	--	--	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.13581	--
MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.11209	0.12593
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.05012	0.05012
CONNECTED HP	--	--	$1.10	$1.10	--	--
TOU-PA-3 -SPLIT WEEK: Rate A	$32.80	$6.00	--	--	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.16141	--
MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.13062	0.14675
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.05012	0.05012
CONNECTED HP	--	--	$1.10	$1.10	--	--
TOU-PA-4 - REDUCED PEAK HOUR: Rate A	$32.80	$6.00	--	--	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.14083	--
MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.11397	0.12804
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.05012	0.05012
CONNECTED HP	--	--	$1.10	$1.10	--	--

APPENDIX C
PAGE 11
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL RATES

RATE SCHEDULE	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW OR HP) SUMMER	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW OR HP) WINTER	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH) SUMMER	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH) WINTER
TOU-PA: Rate B	$32.80	$6.00	--	--	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	$6.55	--	0.13863	--
MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.11219	0.12604
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.05012	0.05012
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE	--	--	$1.25	$1.25	--	--
TOU-PA-3 - SPLIT WEEK: Rate B	$32.80	$6.00	--	--	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	$6.55	--	0.15002	--
MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.12140	0.13639
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.05012	0.05012
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND	--	--	$1.25	$1.25	--	--
TOU-PA-4 - REDUCED PEAK HOUR: Rate B	$32.80	$6.00	--	--	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	$6.55	--	0.13374	--
MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.10823	0.12159
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.05012	0.05012
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE	--	--	$1.25	$1.25	--	--
TOU-PA-5	$32.80	$6.00	--	--	--	--
MINIMUM BILL: $500 PER MONTH						
ON-PEAK	--	--	$6.55	--	0.13116	--
MID-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.10615	0.11925
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.05012	0.05012
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE	--	--	$1.25	$1.25	--	--
TOU-PA-SOP -SUPER OFF-PEAK	$32.80	$6.00	--	--	--	--
ON-PEAK	--	--	$36.05	--	0.09571	--
OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.06947	0.07145
SUPER OFF-PEAK	--	--	--	--	0.03512	0.03512
NON-TIME RELATED DEMAND CHARGE	--	--	$1.25	$1.25	--	--

A.89-03-023 ALJ/RAB
CACD/sl/1

APPENDIX C
PAGE 12
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED STREET LIGHTING RATES
EFFECTIVE 7-01-89

LS-1

ALL NIGHT SERVICE

	BASE ENERGY RATE	OFFSET ENERGY RATE	KWH PER MONTH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	OFFSET ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	FACILITIES CHARGE	PROP. RATE ($/LAMP-MO) (4+5+6)
INCANDESCENT LAMPS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	35.535	0.99462	1.58131	6.24	8.82
2500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	69.690	1.95062	3.10121	6.24	11.29
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	112.615	3.15769	5.02027	6.25	14.43
6000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	154.560	4.32613	6.87792	6.20	17.40
MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS							
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	45.199	1.26501	2.01116	6.23	9.51
7900 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	74.520	2.08581	3.31614	6.20	11.60
12000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	103.845	2.90662	4.62110	6.23	13.76
21000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	163.530	4.57720	7.27709	6.61	18.46
41000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	277.035	7.75421	12.32806	6.67	26.75
55000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	391.575	10.96018	17.42509	6.67	35.06
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM							
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	20.010	0.56006	0.89045	6.23	7.66
5800 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	28.635	0.80149	1.27426	6.20	8.28
9500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	40.365	1.12982	1.79624	6.20	9.13
16000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	66.585	1.86371	2.96303	6.24	11.07
22000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	84.870	2.37551	3.77672	6.60	12.75
27500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	107.985	3.02250	4.80533	6.62	14.45
50000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	167.325	4.68343	7.44596	6.70	18.83
LOW PRESSURE SODIUM							
4800 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	21.735	0.60836	0.96721	6.77	8.35
8000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	28.960	0.81115	1.28961	6.77	8.87
13500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	45.195	1.26501	2.01116	7.70	10.98
22500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	62.790	1.75749	2.79416	7.77	12.32
33000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	79.005	2.21135	3.51572	7.72	13.45

APPENDIX C
PAGE 13
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED STREET LIGHTING RATES
EFFECTIVE 7-01-89

LS-1

MIDNIGHT SERVICE

	BASE ENERGY RATE	OFFSET ENERGY RATE	KWH PER MONTH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	OFFSET ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	FACILITIES CHARGE	PROP. RATE ($/LAMP-MO) (4+5+6)
INCANDESCENT LAMPS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	17.943	0.63411	0.79846	6.24	7.67
2500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	35.188	1.24354	1.56587	6.24	9.05
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	56.963	2.01307	2.53485	6.25	10.80
6000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	78.042	2.75800	3.47287	6.20	12.43
MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS							
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	22.820	0.80646	1.01549	6.23	8.05
7900 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	37.627	1.32974	1.67440	6.20	9.20
12000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	52.434	1.85302	2.33331	6.23	10.42
21000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	82.571	2.91806	3.67441	6.61	13.20
41000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	139.883	4.94347	6.22479	6.67	17.84
55000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	197.717	6.98732	8.79641	6.67	22.46
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM							
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	10.104	0.35708	0.44963	6.23	7.04
5800 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	14.459	0.51098	0.64343	6.20	7.35
9500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	20.361	0.72026	0.90695	6.20	7.83
16000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	33.021	1.16817	1.49613	6.24	8.92
22000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	42.853	1.51443	1.90696	6.60	10.02
27500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	54.535	1.92691	2.42636	6.62	10.97
50000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	84.487	2.98577	3.75967	6.70	13.45
LOW PRESSURE SODIUM							
4800 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	10.975	0.38786	0.48839	6.77	7.65
8000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	14.633	0.51713	0.65117	6.77	7.94
13500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	22.820	0.80646	1.01549	7.70	9.52
22500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	31.704	1.12042	1.41083	7.97	10.50
33000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	39.892	1.40978	1.77519	7.72	10.90

APPENDIX C
PAGE 14
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED STREET LIGHTING RATES
EFFECTIVE 7-01-89

LS-1

MULTIPLE SERVICE/ALL NIGHT

	BASE ENERGY RATE	OFFSET ENERGY RATE	KWH PER MONTH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	OFFSET ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	FACILITIES CHARGE	PROP. RATE ($/LAMP-MO) (4+5+6)
INCANDESCENT LAMPS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	35.535	0.99462	1.58131	0.79	3.37
2500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	69.690	1.95062	3.10121	0.79	5.84
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	112.815	3.15769	5.02027	0.79	8.97
6000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	154.360	4.32613	6.87792	0.79	11.99
10000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	238.050	6.66302	10.59333	0.79	18.05
MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS							
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	45.195	1.26501	2.01116	0.79	4.07
7900 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	74.520	2.08561	3.31614	0.79	6.19
13000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	103.845	2.90662	4.62110	0.79	8.32
21000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	163.530	4.57720	7.27709	0.79	12.64
41000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	277.035	7.75421	12.32606	0.79	20.87
55000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	391.575	10.96018	17.42309	0.79	29.16
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM							
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	20.010	0.56008	0.89045	0.79	2.24
5800 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	28.635	0.80149	1.27426	0.79	2.87
9500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	40.365	1.12982	1.79624	0.79	3.72
16000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	66.585	1.86371	2.96303	0.79	5.62
22000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	84.870	2.37551	3.77672	0.79	6.94
27500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	107.985	3.02250	4.80533	0.79	8.62
37000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	132.135	3.69846	5.88001	0.79	10.37
50000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	167.235	4.68343	7.44496	0.79	12.91
LOW PRESSURE SODIUM							
4800 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	21.735	0.60836	0.96721	0.79	2.37
8000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	28.980	0.81115	1.28961	0.79	2.89
13500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	45.195	1.26501	2.01116	0.79	4.07
22500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	62.790	1.75749	2.79416	0.79	5.34
33000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	79.005	2.21135	3.51572	0.79	6.52

A.89-03-023 ALJ/RAB
CACD/sl/1

APPENDIX C
PAGE 15
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED STREET LIGHTING RATES
EFFECTIVE 7-01-89

LS-2

MULTIPLE SERVICE/MIDNIGHT

	BASE ENERGY RATE	OFFSET ENERGY RATE	KWH PER MONTH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	OFFSET ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	FACILITIES CHARGE	PROP. RATE ($/LAMP-MO) (4+5+6)
INCANDESCENT LAMPS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	17.943	0.63411	0.79846	0.79	2.22
2500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	35.188	1.24354	1.56587	0.79	3.60
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	56.963	2.01307	2.53485	0.79	5.34
6000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	78.042	2.75800	3.47287	0.79	7.02
10000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	120.196	4.24780	5.34881	0.79	10.39
MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS							
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	22.820	0.80646	1.01549	0.79	2.61
7000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	37.627	1.32974	1.67440	0.79	3.79
12000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	52.434	1.85302	2.33331	0.79	4.98
21000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	82.571	2.91806	3.67441	0.79	7.38
41000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	139.883	4.94347	6.22479	0.79	11.96
59000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	197.717	6.98732	8.79841	0.79	16.58
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM							
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	10.104	0.35706	0.44963	0.79	1.60
5800 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	14.459	0.51098	0.64343	0.79	1.94
9500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	20.381	0.72026	0.90695	0.79	2.42
16000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	33.621	1.18817	1.49613	0.79	3.47
22000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	42.853	1.51443	1.90696	0.79	4.21
27500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	54.525	1.92691	2.42636	0.79	5.14
37000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	66.719	2.35785	2.96900	0.79	6.12
50000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	84.487	2.98577	3.75967	0.79	7.54
LOW PRESSURE SODIUM							
4800 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	10.975	0.38786	0.48839	0.79	1.67
8000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	14.633	0.51713	0.65117	0.79	1.96
13500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	22.820	0.80646	1.01549	0.79	2.61
22500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	31.704	1.12042	1.41083	0.79	3.32
33000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	39.692	1.40278	1.77519	0.79	3.97

THE NEXT ___ DOCUMENTS ARE POOR ORIGINALS

MICROFILMING SERVICES WILL NOT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE IMAGE QUALITY

APPENDIX C
PAGE 16
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED STREET LIGHTING RATES
EFFECTIVE 7-01-89

LS-2

SERIES SERVICE/ALL NIGHT

	BASE ENERGY RATE	OFFSET ENERGY RATE	KWH PER MONTH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	OFFSET ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	FACILITIES CHARGE	PROP. RATE ($/LAMP-MO) (4+5+6)
INCANDESCENT LAMPS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
600 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	20.790	0.58191	0.92516	3.55	5.06
1000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	29.528	0.82649	1.31400	3.55	5.69
2500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	64.567	1.80723	2.87323	3.55	8.23
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	97.536	2.73289	4.34489	3.55	10.63
6000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	136.614	3.82383	6.07932	3.55	13.45
10000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	227.559	6.36938	10.12638	3.55	20.05
15000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	367.590	10.68584	29.70776	3.55	31.94
MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS							
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	51.675	1.44636	2.29954	3.55	7.30
7900 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	85.374	2.39522	3.80804	3.55	9.75
12000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	117.819	3.29775	5.24295	3.55	12.09
21000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	183.963	5.14912	8.18635	3.55	16.89
41000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	314.184	8.79401	13.98119	3.55	26.33
55000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	442.338	12.38104	19.68404	3.55	35.62
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM							
4000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	30.746	0.86056	1.36820	3.55	5.78
5800 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	40.834	1.14294	1.81711	3.55	6.51
9500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	58.128	1.62700	2.58670	3.55	7.76
16000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	83.590	2.33968	3.71976	3.55	9.61
22000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	111.933	3.13300	4.98102	3.55	11.66
LOW PRESSURE SODIUM							
4800 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	24.223	0.67806	1.07801	3.55	5.31
8000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	34.200	0.95726	1.52190	3.55	6.03
13500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	61.750	1.72838	2.74788	3.55	8.03
22500 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	87.675	2.45962	3.91044	3.55	9.92
33000 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	104.025	2.91166	4.62911	3.55	11.09

APPENDIX C
PAGE 17
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED STREET LIGHTING RATES
EFFECTIVE 7-01-89

LS-2

SERIES SERVICE/MIDNIGHT

	BASE ENERGY RATE	OFFSET ENERGY RATE	KWH PER MONTH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	OFFSET ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	FACILITIES CHARGE	PROP. RATE ($/LAMP-MO) (4+5+6)
INCANDESCENT LAMPS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	14.918	0.52720	0.66385	3.55	4.74
2500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	32.620	1.15279	1.45159	3.55	6.15
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	49.327	1.74322	2.19505	3.55	7.49
6000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	69.016	2.43910	3.07130	3.55	9.06
10000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	114.964	4.06283	5.11590	3.55	12.73
MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS							
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	26.113	0.92283	1.16203	3.55	5.63
7900 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	43.242	1.52817	1.92427	3.55	7.00
12000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	59.537	2.10404	2.64940	3.55	8.20
21000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	92.961	3.28524	4.13676	3.55	10.97
41000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	158.764	5.61072	7.06500	3.55	16.23
55000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	223.523	7.89930	9.94677	3.55	21.40
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM							
4000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	15.539	0.54915	0.69149	3.55	4.79
5800 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	20.638	0.72935	0.91839	3.55	5.20
9500 LUMEN	0 03534	0.04450	29.379	1.03825	1.30737	3.55	5.90
16000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	42.247	1.49301	1.87999	3.55	6.92
22000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	56.572	1.99925	2.51745	3.55	8.07
LOW PRESSURE SODIUM							
4800 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	12.240	0.43256	0.54468	3.55	4.53
8000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	17.280	0.61068	0.76896	3.55	4.93
13500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	31.200	1.10261	1.38840	3.55	6.04
22500 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	44.400	1.56910	1.97580	3.55	7.09
33000 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	52.560	1.85747	2.33892	3.55	7.75
NON STANDARD LAMPS							
ALL NIGHT MULT	0.02799	0.04450	102.548	2.87032	4.56339	0.79	8.22
ALL NIGHT SERIES	0.02799	0.04450	117.023	3.27547	5.20752	3.55	12.03
MIDNIGHT MULT	0.03534	0.04450	82.571	2.91806	3.67441	0.79	7.38
MIDNIGHT SERIES	0.03534	0.04450	59.077	2.08778	2.62893	3.55	8.27

APPENDIX C
PAGE 18
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PROPOSED STREET LIGHTING RATES
EFFECTIVE 7-01-89

GS-1

	BASE ENERGY RATE	OFFSET ENERGY RATE	ANNUAL CMH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	OFFSET ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	CUSTOMER CHARGE
	(1)	(2)				
TOTAL ENERGY	0.01799	0.04450	40,300	1,127,997	1,793,350	
CUSTOMER CHARGE						
MULTIPLE	0	0.00000	0	0	0	6.62
SERIES	0	0.00000	0	0	0	100.77

OL

	BASE ENERGY RATE	OFFSET ENERGY RATE	KWH PER MONTH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	OFFSET ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	FACILITIES CHARGE	PROP. RATE ($/LAMP-MO)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
RATE A	0.01799	0.04450	33,341	0.99922	1.63917	0.33	6.80
RATE B	0.01799	0.04450	37,341	0.99922	1.63917	3.13	6.40
RATE C	0.00000	0.00000	0.000	0.00000	0.00000	0.40	0.40

OL-1 ALLNIGHT SERVICE

	BASE ENERGY RATE	ADJUSTMENT ENERGY RATE	KWH PER MONTH	BASE ENERGY CHG. (1*3)	ADJUSTMENT ENERGY CHG. (2*3)	FACILITIES CHARGE	PROP. RATE ($/LAMP-MO)
MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
175 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	74.320	2.08361	3.31614	5.09	10.49
400 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	168,460	4.71520	7.49647	5.50	17.71
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM							
70 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	28.635	0.80149	1.27420	5.09	7.17
100 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	40,365	1.12982	1.79624	5.09	8.02
200 LUMEN	0.02799	0.04450	84,670	2.37551	3.77672	5.49	11.64

OL-1 MIDNIGHT SERVICE

MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS							
175 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	37.627	1.32974	1.67440	5.09	8.09
400 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	82.571	2.91806	3.67441	5.50	12.09
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM							
70 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	14.459	0.51098	0.64343	5.09	6.24
100 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	20.381	0.72026	0.90695	5.09	6.72
200 LUMEN	0.03534	0.04450	42.853	1.51443	1.90696	5.49	8.91

OL-1 POLE CHARGE

						2.20	2.20

(END APPENDIX C)

than 5% of gross revenue, (2) whether the method of computing the increase could be altered from that used in past proceedings, and (3) whether revenue allocation and rate design should differ from that used in past proceedings. Prior to the hearing the DRA moved to dismiss because its analysis showed an ECAC increase of less than 5%, which is below the 5% threshold for the trigger filing. The ALJ denied the motion on the ground that it was based on allegations which showed a conflict in the evidence which required a hearing. The ALJ reserved the issue for briefing at the end of the hearing should the evidence show less than ± 5% revenue change.

Toward Utility Rate Normalization (TURN) moved to exclude revenue allocation as an issue and to substitute a simple equal percentage change for all classes. This motion was opposed by Edison, the DRA, the California Large Energy Consumers Association, and others. Those in opposition desired to move further along the path toward an Equal Percentage of Marginal Cost (EPMC) revenue allocation. In denying TURN's motion, the ALJ observed that Edison proposed an allocation closer to EPMC than that found reasonable in Edison's last ECAC case, that the DRA differed with Edison in regard to marginal energy costs, that other parties had conflicting views on rate design, and that TURN opposed any EPMC in a trigger filing, with the consequence that to litigate this issue would consume more time than the five days allotted for hearing. The ALJ ruled that the revenue allocation and rate design authorized in Edison's last ECAC decision would be used in this application.

The Cogenerators of Southern California, a group representing qualifying facilities (QF's), moved to exclude avoided cost issues. This motion was denied on the ground that the moving party made no showing that avoided costs would be a issue in this proceeding. Edison moved for summary judgment regarding forecast expense for certain nonstandard QF contracts. The ALJ denied this motion on the ground that all forecasts were at issue, but held that the reasonableness of QF contracts would not be at issue. The

compared with the regular annual ECAC schedule of 76 days between first day of hearing and ALJ decision.

We conclude from our review of our reasons for reducing the ECAC procedures from three to two annually, for providing a trigger which might obviate one of those hearings, and for providing only 18 days for hearing and ALJ decision in a trigger proceeding that the issues in a trigger filing should be as few as possible.

The presiding ALJ ruled correctly when he refused to consider modifications to the method of achieving revenue allocation and rate design which we approved in Edison's last ECAC decision. Nor should a trigger ECAC consider reasonableness reviews, avoided cost issues, marginal energy cost methodology, or any issue that is time consuming or better heard within the broad scope of a regular ECAC proceeding, which for Edison began May 30, 1989 with the filing of A.89-05-064.

At the hearing there was also discussed a modification of the base rate revenue estimate which shows an expected $114 million overcollection in the forecast year, due to increased sales. Although this modification was incorporated into the revenue requirement agreement between Edison and the DRA, Edison argues that we should not order this and other changes in all trigger filings. We will accept Edison's argument.

No change to Edison's Annual Energy Rate (AER) is needed because by D.89-01-040 the AER is suspended through the end of 1989. Even if the AER were not suspended, rate decisions in response to trigger applications do not change the AER. In A.84-11-054, a trigger filing by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, we stated, "In accordance with D.83-02-076 and D.83-11-019 the AER will not change as a result of this filing." (Sheet 3 of D.85-04-004.)

Coincident with rate changes sought in this application Edison has requested that rate changes be authorized for four other

2/3 System Average Percent Change (SAPC) and 1/3 EPMC, with a 2.5% cap over SAPC. The adopted allocation is shown in Appendix C to this decision.

Comments to ALJ Proposed Decision

This decision was issued as a Proposed Decision, and comments were received from Edison, the DRA, the Industrial Users, and the California Farm Bureau Federation. Edison requested that the increase be permitted to go into effect; the other three commenting parties support the denial of the increase. Based on Edison's comments on the Proposed Decision's attempt to modify the trigger mechanism aurhorized in D.83-11-019, we have deleted the modifying language, but this has no impact on the end result.

Findings of Fact

1. Edison's present rate revenue for forecast year July 1, 1989 - June 30, 1990 is $6,182,000,000.

2. In its application Edison alleged that its ECAC revenue for the forecast year would be undercollected by approximately $435 million, which is more than 5% greater than its forecast year present rate revenue.

3. In the forecast year ECAC rates are expected to be undercollected by $416.6 million, base rates overcollected by $114.3 million and ERAM rates overcollected by $151.7 million for a net undercollection of $150.6 million, or 2.4% of revenues at present rates.

4. Granting of this application would also increase forecast year revenues by an additional $50.6 million to provide for the costs of Balsam Meadows, Devers Valley-Serrano, Sylmar-Pacific HVDC Intertie Expansion, and elimination of the CLMAC, thereby making the net rate increase 3.25% of present rate revenue.

5. Edison and DRA agree that if an increase is granted the amount should be $201.2 million and the increase should become effective July 1, 1989.

6. Authorization of a July 1, 1989 increase (1) may moderate a larger increase in A.89-05-064, Edison's next scheduled ECAC case, and other proceedings; (2) would move Edison's residential rates closer to EPMC; (3) may reduce ECAC and ERAM over- or undercollections; (4) would move Edison's rates closer to actual current costs; and (5) would coordinate the requested rate changes with changes authorized in other proceedings.

7. Use of the revenue allocation scheme adopted in Edison's last ECAC application is reasonable.

Conclusions of Law

1. Edison has met its ECAC trigger filing obligation by filing of this application.

2. Authorization of a trigger rate change where the adopted change is less than ±5% is at the Commission's discretion.

3. The relief requested in the application, as modified by the revenue agreement between Edison and the DRA, should be granted.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Southern California Edison Company shall file revised tariff sheets to reflect the revenue changes shown in Appendix B and the rates shown in Appendix C to this decision.

2. The revised tariff sheets shall conform to General Order 96-A, shall be marked to show that they were authorized by this decision and shall become effective three (3) days after the date filed, but no sooner than July 1, 1989. The revised tariffs shall apply only to service on or after their effective date.

3. This order is effective today.

Dated JUN 21 1989, at San Francisco, California.

G. MITCHELL WILK
President
FREDERICK R. DUDA
STANLEY W. HULETT
JOHN B. OHANIAN
PATRICIA M. ECKERT
Commissioners