

From: Darrah.Morgan@sce.com
Sent: 4/16/2010 6:32:02 PM
To: Blumer, Werner M. (werner.blumer@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: case.admin@sce.com (case.admin@sce.com); Hughes, John (Reg Rel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J8HS); Redacted
Redacted Schumacher, Brian D. (brian.schumacher@cpuc.ca.gov); Redacted
Redacted Redacted
Redacted
mcaulson@semprautilities.com (mcaulson@semprautilities.com);
mcaulson@semprautilities.com (mcaulson@semprautilities.com);
lisa.ornelas@sce.com (lisa.ornelas@sce.com); Lisa.Vellanoweth@sce.com (Lisa.Vellanoweth@sce.com); Loring.Fiske-phillips@sce.com (Loring.Fiske-phillips@sce.com)

Bcc:

Subject: RE: DATA REQUEST:Revision of Rules 15 and 16 and SCE AL 2453-E

Werner, regarding the proposed "Applicant" definition, the three IOUs agree to the following language for Rules 15 and 16. SCE will be providing substitute sheets to Advice 2453-E to accommodate this change.

Applicant: A person, residential or nonresidential developer, or agency requesting utility to supply permanent electric service.

Regarding what type of "agency" is being referred to in the definition above - I understand SDG&E considers an "agency" to be a governmental, redevelopment, or non-profit agency, similar to what you had mentioned when we last spoke. SCE and PG&E do not have any specific insight on the historical meaning or what type of agency is meant exactly by this wording.

Thank you.

Dara Morgan

SCE - Regulatory Policy & Affairs

Pax 22086 / 626 302-2086

Fax 21626 / 626 302-1626

Darrah.Morgan@sce.com

From:
"Blumer, Werner
M." <werner.blumer@cpuc.ca.gov>
To:
<Darrah.Morgan@sce.com>,
<Case.Admin@sce.com>
Cc:
"Schumacher, Brian
D." <brian.schumacher@cpuc.ca.gov>
Date:
04/13/2010 09:10 AM
Subject:
DATA REQUEST:Revision
of Rules 15 and 16 and SCE AL 2453-E

Dara,

Thank you very much for this info.
I do not know what impact if any this has on the wording of the Applicant
definition and treatment of developers though, if any.

As to implication of considering
developers as permanent customers, thus avoiding a time limit to receive
service after SCE is ready to serve, I wonder how much rate impact that
may have. SCE would not collect deficiency payments and that would have
to be made up by the ratepayers. Any estimate on that and should that be
shown on cover page of an AL supplement for the revised definition ?

Thank you very much for the insightful
conversation yesterday and I am expecting a proposed revised Applicant
definition accordingly and agreed upon by the 3 major IOUs.

Werner

From: Darrah.Morgan@sce.com [<mailto:Darrah.Morgan@sce.com>]

Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 12:17 PM

To: Blumer, Werner M.

Subject: RE: DATA REQUEST: Compliance with R. 92-03-050 standardization
of Rules 15 and 16 and SCE AL 2453-E

Werner, per our discussion this morning
regarding whether a development of five or more dwelling units is considered
residential or commercial, I thought I'd share these definitions with you.

These definitions are the same for SCE, PG&E, and SDG&E.
I'm assuming you don't me to clarify with PG&E or SDG&E any
longer since these definitions are within Rule 15 and 16, but please let
me know if you feel otherwise. Thanks.

Residential Development: Five (5) or more dwelling units in two (2) or more buildings located

on a single parcel of land.

Commercial Development: Two (2) or more enterprises engaged in trade or the furnishing of

services, (e.g., shopping centers, sales enterprises, business offices, professional offices, and

educational or governmental complexes) and located on a single parcel or on two (2) or more

contiguous parcels of land.

Dara Morgan

SCE - Regulatory Policy & Affairs

Pax 22086 / 626 302-2086

Fax 21626 / 626 302-1626

Darrah.Morgan@sce.com

From: "Blumer,
Werner M." <werner.blumer@cpuc.ca.gov>

To: "Caulson,
Megan" <MCaulson@semprautilities.com>

Cc: [Redacted]
[Redacted], <Darrah.Morgan@sce.com>

Date: 04/12/2010
11:27 AM

Subject: RE:
DATA REQUEST: Compliance with R. 92-03-050 standardization of Rules 15
and 16 and SCE AL 2453-E

Megan,

Thank you for considering this change. Meanwhile Darrah Morgan, Lisa Ornelas and I had a conversation about this issue and they will contact you and PG&E about a slight addition to the definition to clarify it better for customers and tie it in with "permanent".

Have a great day,

Werner

From: Caulson, Megan [<mailto:MCaulson@semprautilities.com>]

Sent: Friday, April 09, 2010 12:41 PM

To: Blumer, Werner M.

Cc: [Redacted] 'Darrah.Morgan@sce.com'

Subject: FW: DATA REQUEST: Compliance with R. 92-03-050 standardization of Rules 15 and 16 and SCE AL 2453-E

Werner,

Hope you've been doing well...

Per your note below, SDG&E has reviewed it's definition of "Applicant" in both Electric Rules 15 & 16 and is in agreement with the recommendation from the ED to clarify our current understanding/processes by adding the word "developer" to the current definition of Applicant.

I'll get an Advice Letter drafted to modify SDG&E's Electric Rule 15 -- Distribution Line Extensions (Section J - Definitions) & Electric Rule 16 -- Service Extensions (Section H - Definitions) so that they will read:

Applicant: A person,
developer, or agency requesting utility
to supply electric service

Please let me know if anything changes or we need to do anything further.

Thanks,

Megan Caulson

SDG&E Rates, Regulations & Tariffs

From: Blumer, Werner M. <werner.blumer@cpuc.ca.gov>

To: Hughes, John (Reg Rel) <J8HS@pge.com>; Redacted

Cc: Darrah.Morgan@sce.com <Darrah.Morgan@sce.com>; Schumacher,
Brian D. <brian.schumacher@cpuc.ca.gov>

Sent: Mon Apr 05 11:04:49 2010

Subject: DATA REQUEST: Compliance with R. 92-03-050 standardization
of Rules 15 and 16 and SCE AL 2453-E

Dear Mr.. Hughes and Ms. Redacted

Subject SCE AL requests inclusion of "developer" in the "Applicant"
definition reflecting SCE's changed treatment of those with regards
to Line and Service extensions in a manner already practice with PG&E
and SDG&E since 1992.

Evaluation of this proposal revealed however that PG&E's and SDG&E's
tariff does not define "developer" specifically as Applicant.
For the sake of clarity and compliance with R. 92-03-050 for tariff consistency
we suggest that PG&E and SDG&E consider amending their tariffs
accordingly and request your plan on this issue.

Thank you very much for your response by April 12, 2010.

Sincerely,

Werner Blumer

CPUC - Energy Division