BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39E) for Approval of Amended Purchase and Sale Agreement Between Pacific Gas And Electric Company and Contra Costa Generating Station LLC and for Adoption of Cost Recovery and Ratemaking Mechanisms	Application No. 12-03-____

APPLICATION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 39 E) FOR APPROVAL OF AMENDED PURCHASE AND SALE AGREEMENT BETWEEN PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND CONTRA COSTA GENERATING STATION LLC AND FOR ADOPTION OF COST RECOVERY AND RATEMAKING MECHANISMS

WILLIAM V. MANHEIM
CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, B30A
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 973-6971
Facsimile: (415) 973-5520
E-mail: CRMd@pge.com

Attorney for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: March 30, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Page

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39E) for Approval of Amended Purchase and Sale Agreement Between Pacific Gas And Electric Company and Contra Costa Generating Station LLC and for Adoption of Cost Recovery and Ratemaking Mechanisms	Application No. 12-03-____

APPLICATION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 39 E) FOR APPROVAL OF AMENDED PURCHASE AND SALE AGREEMENT BETWEEN PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND CONTRA COSTA GENERATING STATION LLC AND FOR ADOPTION OF COST RECOVERY AND RATEMAKING MECHANISMS

I. INTRODUCTION

Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E") respectfully submits this Application pursuant to Article 2 of the California Public Utilities Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure ("Rules") and requests that the Commission approve the Amended and Restated Purchase and Sale Agreement ("Amended PSA") between PG&E and Contra Costa Generating Station LLC ("CCGS") for the proposed Oakley Generating Station ("Oakley Project") located in Oakley, California.

The Oakley Project is a state-of-the-art, flexible, highly efficient, new generation resource that will be located in an area identified by the Commission and the California Independent System Operator ("CAISO") as requiring local resource adequacy. The Oakley Project was originally proposed in PG&E's 2008 Long-Term Request for Offers ("LTRFO"), where it was selected as a winning bid with one of the best market valuations of all of the offers received in PG&E's 2008 LTRFO. The technologically advanced turbines that will be used in

the Oakley Project will make the facility one of the most efficient conventional generating resources in California and will allow for the reduction of greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions by facilitating the retirement of certain existing, inefficient once-through cooling ("OTC") facilities. In addition, the Oakley Project will be one of the most operationally flexible combined-cycle facilities in California. The Oakley Project enjoys widespread support from local, state, and national officials, as well as strong support from the Contra Costa Central Building & Construction Trades Council, Contra Costa County, and the Oakley community.

PG&E originally proposed the Oakley Project, as well as two other winning bids from the 2008 LTRFO, in an application filed with the Commission in September 2009. Numerous parties submitted voluminous evidence and lengthy briefs supporting and opposing the Oakley Project. In July 2010, the Commission issued a decision agreeing that the Oakley Project had numerous "beneficial features,"[1] but concluded that the Oakley Project, which was originally scheduled to come on-line in June 2014, was not needed at that time.[2]

After the Commission issued its decision, PG&E and CCGS agreed to amend the original Purchase and Sale Agreement ("Original PSA") to change the Guaranteed Commercial Availability Date ("GCAD") for the Oakley Project from June 2014 to June 2016 at no additional cost to PG&E's customers. Given the well-documented Oakley Project benefits, PG&E decided to file a petition to modify the Commission's earlier decision and requested Commission approval of the Oakley Project based on the two-year extension in the GCAD. In December 2010, after further lengthy briefing, the Commission approved the Oakley Project, describing in detail the project benefits and concluding that the proposed facility was highly viable, efficient, would facilitate the retirement of aging, inefficient existing facilities, and would

[1] Decision ("D.") 10-07-045 at p. 40.

[2] *Id.* at p. 39 and Ordering Paragraph ("OP") 3.

assist with the integration of renewable resources.[3] While the Commission agreed with PG&E that the Oakley Project merited approval, it also determined that a petition for modification was not the proper procedural vehicle to reconsider the Oakley Project and thus the Commission *sua sponte* converted PG&E's petition for modification to a new application.[4] In May 2011, the Commission reaffirmed its decision approving the Oakley Project by unanimously denying applications for rehearing filed by four parties.[5]

Two parties, The Utility Reform Network ("TURN") and Communities for a Better Environment ("CBE") appealed the Commission's decisions approving the Oakley Project on procedural and substantive grounds. On March 16, 2012, the California Court of Appeal, First District ("Court") issued an unpublished order granting TURN's appeal. The Court determined on procedural grounds that the Commission had not allowed TURN or other parties sufficient opportunity to protest the new application, conduct discovery, or present evidence concerning the Amended PSA for the Oakley Project. Notably, the Court did not address the merits of the Oakley Project. Instead, the Court specifically deferred to the Commission to "weigh the benefits of the Oakley Project" to determine if the project is in the public interest.[6]

In response to the Court's decision, PG&E is filing this Application requesting that the Commission review and approve the Oakley Project and the Amended PSA. As explained in more detail below, since the Commission approved the Oakley Project in December 2010, a number of new developments have occurred that only reinforce the need for the Oakley Project and the Commission's earlier determination regarding its viability and benefits. PG&E has

---

[3] D.10-12-050, Findings of Fact ("FOF") 3-6.

[4] *Id.* at pp. 7-8.

[5] D.11-05-049.

[6] *TURN v. California Public Utilities Commission*, Case No. A.132439 (Cal. Ct. App. 1st Dist.), unpublished decision issued on March 16, 2012 ("*TURN*") at p. 26.

proposed in this Application a schedule which will provide parties with their full due process rights, including discovery, testimony and hearings, while ensuring that the Oakley Project is expeditiously reviewed so that development can proceed and the project can be available in 2016. This proceeding will allow the Commission to fully address the procedural concerns identified by the Court in *TURN*. PG&E is also proposing that the cost recovery and ratemaking mechanisms approved by the Commission as a part of a partial settlement in PG&E's application for the 2008 LTRFO be adopted by the Commission in this proceeding.

The only thing that has changed since December 2010 when the Commission approved the Oakley Project is that the need for this operationally flexible, highly efficient new generation facility is even greater today than it was 15 months ago. The Oakley Project is beneficial for the system and exactly the kind of facility that the CAISO has identified is needed in California. In short, given its substantial benefits, the Oakley Project and the Amended PSA should be expeditiously approved.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE OAKLEY PROJECT AND AMENDED PSA

A. The Oakley Project

The proposed Oakley Project is a 586 megawatt ("MW") state-of-the-art combined-cycle facility that will be located in Oakley, California and will consist of two GE 7FA.05 gas turbines, two heat recovery steam generators, and one steam turbine producing 586 MW under July peak conditions. The facility will have an expected heat rate of 6,752 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour ("Btu/kWh"), among the lowest in PG&E's portfolio of conventional resources. The Oakley Project is being developed by Radback Energy, which currently employs a number of individuals with a wealth of successful generation development and permitting experience, including the permitting and development of over 7,000 MW of resources in California. The Oakley Project will be located adjacent to an industrial site currently owned by DuPont and is

near necessary gas and electric interconnections. The Oakley Project's new technology will set new standards for power plants, including reduced carbon dioxide ("CO_2") emissions due to the low heat rate. The Oakley Project will also provide Bay Area Resource Adequacy ("RA") capacity and provide a reliable new generation resource.

Oakley will be one of the first of a new series of combined-cycle facilities based on an evolutionary upgrade to the General Electric 7FA series of turbines designed to provide higher efficiency, greater output, higher availability, and reduced maintenance, all while maintaining extremely low emissions. With the Rapid Response technology and various controls improvements associated with the new turbine design, the Oakley Project will have significantly reduced startup and shutdown emissions, as compared to existing combined-cycle facilities.

In addition, the Oakley Project is more than just an upgrade of older combined-cycle technology. Electricity will be generated by the turbines and a reheat steam turbine operating on heat energy recovered from the turbines' exhaust. By recovering this heat, which would otherwise be lost up the exhaust stacks, the efficiency of this combined-cycle power plant is increased as compared to either gas turbines or a steam turbine operating alone. This configuration is thus well suited to not only the large, steady loads met by a base load plant that generates energy efficiently over long periods of time, but also to rapid start and rapid load change. Furthermore, the project will use evaporative inlet air coolers, two triple-pressure Heat Recovery Steam Generators ("HRSG") and a power cycle cooling system, all to further enhance Oakley's efficiency.

Actual air emissions will be controlled through the use of dry low nitrogen oxide ("NOx") combustion coupled with selective catalytic reduction systems. Each heat recovery steam generator will be equipped with a selective catalytic reduction system to further reduce NOx, and a carbon monoxide ("CO") catalyst to control emissions of CO.

Besides the environmental benefits, such as reduced CO_2 emissions per kWh that flow directly from its low heat rate, the Oakley Project will use air cooling instead of water cooling. That will reduce its water use by roughly 90% when compared to similar combined-cycle plants that utilize water for cooling.

The Oakley Project is also operationally flexible and capable of providing a number of CAISO ancillary services, including:

- Non-spinning reserves[7]: The Oakley Project will be able to turn on and provide a significant part of its output within 10 minutes, which is an ancillary service product required by the CAISO to manage the system called non-spinning reserves. Non-spinning reserve is a capability that conventional combined-cycle facilities are not able to provide. This quick start capability is essential for responding to rapidly changing system conditions that will only increase in frequency of occurrence as more intermittent renewables are added to the system.

- Spinning reserves over a large range[8]: The Oakley Project also will have the ability to quickly ramp production up and down from its minimum to maximum operating level. Both non-spinning and spinning reserves give the CAISO the ability to respond to system disturbances, such as the sudden loss or sudden increase of solar production or wind production. Such ancillary services will become increasingly important as more resources with reduced operating flexibility and variable and unpredictable production are added to the system to meet renewable goals. Further, while start speed and flexibility are very important, the ability to shut down quickly is also essential to respond to times when wind or solar production spikes upward quickly.

- Regulation up or down[9]: The Oakley Project also can provide regulation up or down under Automatic Generation Control ("AGC"). AGC puts the unit's operation under the CAISO's control so it can balance the system and follow load on an instantaneous basis.

---

[7] Non-spinning reserves are defined as generating capacity that is capable of being synchronized and ramping to a specified load in 10 minutes.

[8] Spinning reserve is defined as unloaded synchronized generating capacity that is immediately responsive to system frequency and that is capable of being loaded in 10 minutes, and that is capable of running for at least two hours.

[9] Regulation provided by a resource that can increase (regulation up) or decrease (regulation down) its actual operating level in response to a direct electronic signal from the CAISO to maintain standard frequency in accordance with established Reliability Criteria. This capability can only be provided by units with AGC.

! Short minimum run times: The Oakley Project has a reasonably short minimum startup-time, and therefore will not be constrained from coming up to meet emergency needs and then shutting back down when no longer needed, as demonstrated when loads may be low during mild spring weather. This beneficial element is lacking in a majority of the gas fired combined-cycle plants operating in California.

In summary, the Oakley Project's new technology represents a significant improvement over both peaking and combined-cycle plants. This new technology allows rapid start, rapid response, and high efficiency while based on low water consumption through dry cooling and a reduced level of greenhouse gas emissions through higher efficiency.

B. The Amended PSA

Under the terms of the Amended PSA, CCGS will develop, construct and transfer the Oakley Project to PG&E. The Amended PSA requires that the Oakley Project be able to satisfy specific operating characteristics, and that the Oakley Project conforms to Bay Area Air Quality Management District ("BAAQMD") requirements and have all necessary permits for initial operation before the sale to PG&E. The Amended PSA includes numerous standard contractual provisions, such as termination rights, credit provisions and contingency and cost provisions.

C. The Current Permitting Status Of The Oakley Project

The Oakley Project is a fully permitted and began construction in June 2011. On May 23, 2011, the California Energy Commission ("CEC") issued Order 11-0518-15, unanimously approving the license for the Oakley Project, granting the authority to construct the plant.[10] In accordance with the Warren Alquist Act, the CEC was the lead California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") agency for the Oakley Project, and in acting as such, independently evaluated the project to ensure that it preserved environmental quality, public health and safety and general welfare.

---

[10] *See* California Energy Commission Decision on Oakley Project, http://www.energy.ca.gov/2011publications/CEC-800-2011-002/CEC-800-2011-002-CMF.pdf

On January 21, 2011, the BAAQMD issued its Final Determination of Compliance ("FDOC") for the Oakley Project.[11] This marked another key step in the permitting process, as the BAAQMD's decision delineated how the Oakley Project will comply with applicable air quality regulations, as well as permit conditions to ensure compliance. Within this licensing process, the BAAQMD collaborates with the CEC regarding the air quality portion of its environmental analysis and prepares a "Determination of Compliance" that outlines whether and how the proposed project will comply with applicable air quality regulatory requirements. The BAAQMD solicited and considered public input on the PDOC, prior to its FDOC for use by the CEC in its environmental review. The BAAQMD issued an Authority To Construct ("ATC") to CCGS on June 2, 2011, and the project began construction immediately thereafter. The BAAQMD's decision noted the Oakley Project's innovative highly efficient design employing state-of-the-art technology.[12]

III. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. The 2008 LTRFO

PG&E's 2008 LTRFO was initiated on April 1, 2008 and produced a robust response. After an extensive evaluation and negotiation process, overseen by an Independent Evaluator ("IE") and PG&E's Procurement Review Group ("PRG"), PG&E selected winning bids for three new generation resources (*i.e.,* the Mariposa, Marsh Landing, and Oakley Projects) and one existing Qualifying Facility (*i.e.*, Midway Sunset). At the conclusion of the 2008 LTRFO process, the IE concluded that PG&E had run a "fair and rigorous solicitation." With regard to the Oakley Project, after explaining that the facility was "highly efficient," provided "flexible

[11] *See* Bay Area Air Quality Management District Final Determination of Compliance, http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Engineering/Public%20Notices/2011/20798/Oakley%20FDOC%20January%202011.ashx?la=en

[12] *Id.*

energy deliveries and ancillary services," and was viable, the IE concluded that the facility merited Commission approval. PG&E filed an initial application in April 1, 2009 seeking Commission approval of the Mariposa Project. The Commission approved the Mariposa Project in D.09-10-017. The Marsh Landing and Oakley Projects were presented to the Commission in a separate, subsequent application in September 2009 (A.09-09-021). The outcome of PG&E's initial application for the Oakley Project is described below.

B. The Commission Decision Preliminarily Rejected The Oakley Project

PG&E filed voluminous evidence in A.09-09-021 in support of the Marsh Landing and Oakley Projects. A number of intervenors supported these projects, while others opposed them on various grounds. After several rounds of testimony, the parties agreed to waive hearings and instead submitted lengthy post-hearing briefs addressing each of the proposed projects. After reviewing the record, the Commission determined that all of the winning 2008 LTRFO bids, including the Oakley Project, had many "attributes desirable for renewable integration and offer[s] numerous environmental benefits relative to many generating resources currently operating as a part of PG&E's Resource Adequacy Portfolio."[13] However, the Commission concluded that the Oakley Project exceeded the Commission's earlier need determination and thus the Commission denied the Oakley Project at that time.[14] In his concurrence, Commissioner Bohn noted that he would have "liked the opportunity to consider approving the Oakley project, but with a later date for construction and operation, so as to better match the needs of PG&E and its ratepayers."[15] Given the Oakley Project benefits, the Commission went on to explain that PG&E could resubmit the Oakley Project by an application if: (1) another approved new

---

[13] D.10-07-045 at p. 39-40.

[14] *Id.*, OP 3.

[15] *Id.*, Commissioner Bohn Concurrence at p. 2.

generation resource failed; (2) PG&E was able to retire an OTC plant at least three years ahead of schedule; or (3) the CAISO Renewable Integration Study demonstrates that "there are significant negative reliability risks from integrating a 33% Renewable Portfolio Standard."[16]

C. The Commission Decision Subsequently Approving The Oakley Project

In response to Commissioner Bohn's comments in his concurrence, PG&E and CCGS subsequently agreed to extend the GCAD for the Oakley Project from June 2014 to June 2016. PG&E promptly submitted a petition to modify the Commission's July 2010 decision and requested approval of the Oakley Project and the Amended PSA. After extensive briefing by parties supporting and opposing the Oakley Project, the Commission approved it in December 2010. In its decision, the Commission addressed the substantive benefits of the Oakley Project, noting that it was "highly viable," "highly efficient," would allow for the retirement of aging facilities with high heat rates, would facilitate the integration of renewable resources with its load following capabilities, and would reduce the risk of insufficient new generation in the future given regulatory lag.[17] The Commission also discussed at length the unique operating characteristics of the Oakley Project.[18] With regard to procedural issues raised in parties' briefs, the Commission determined that PG&E's petition for modification was not the proper procedural vehicle for review of the Oakley Project.[19] Instead, the Commission *sua sponte* considered PG&E's filing as an application and, through this new application, approved the Oakley Project.

In response to Applications for Rehearing filed by four parties, the Commission described at length the benefits of the Oakley Project and provided detailed citations to the

---

[16] *Id.* at pp. 40-41.

[17] D.10-12-050, FOF 3-10.

[18] *Id.* at pp. 8-12.

[19] *Id.* at pp. 7-8.

record to demonstrate these benefits.[20] The Commission also cited extensive evidence in the record demonstrating that the Oakley Project was one of the "highest value" projects in the 2008 LTRFO.[21] Finally, with regard to procedural issues raised in the parties' Applications for Rehearing, the Commission provided a lengthy discussion of the due process provided to parties throughout the proceeding and its statutory authority to *sua sponte* convert PG&E's petition to modify into a new application.

D. The Court of Appeal Decision

TURN appealed the Commission's decision to the Court of Appeal and CBE appealed both the Commission and CEC decisions on the Oakley Project to the California Supreme Court.[22] In September 2011, the Supreme Court stayed briefing on CBE's appeal and allowed the TURN appeal to proceed. Parties submitted briefs in the Fall 2011. On March 16, 2012, the Court issued its decision reversing the Commission's decisions approving the Oakley Project. The Court was clear in its decision that it was not addressing the merits of the Oakley Project.[23] However, the Court determined that the Commission should have given the parties an opportunity to litigate the new issues raised in the Commission's *sua sponte* application "through discovery and the presentation of evidence."[24] Specifically, the Court concluded that parties were "entitled under the Commission's rules to file a protest, conduct discovery on the new issues, and to have an assigned commissioner determine the need for an evidentiary hearing."[25] This Application addresses and responds to the process deficiencies identified by the Court.

---

[20] D.11-05-049 at pp. 27-32.

[21] *Id.* at pp. 34-35.

[22] *See Communities for a Better Environment v. CPUC, et al.*, California Supreme Court, Case No. S194079.

[23] *TURN* at p. 26.

[24] *Id.* at pp. 20-21, 24.

[25] *Id.* at p. 15.

E. Subsequent Developments Since The Commission Approved The Oakley Project

While TURN's appeal was pending, there have been a number of significant new developments that only further support the need for the Oakley Project. First, the CAISO has been actively involved in studies and analysis in both the Commission's Long-Term Procurement Plan ("LTPP") proceeding (*i.e.*, Rulemaking ("R.") 10-05-006) and on its own initiative regarding the impact of the 33% Renewable Portfolio Standard ("RPS") on the California electric system. The results of these studies and analysis have been concerning. In a Straw Proposal issued on March 7, 2012 regarding the procurement of flexible capacity, the CAISO concluded that "[w]hile the energy production of [existing] conventional resources is being displaced by intermittent resources, the ISO will need even more flexible capacity that many conventional resources provide in order to maintain grid reliability under the 33 percent RPS. Consequently, the need to ensure that a sufficient fleet of flexible resources is maintained will only increase."[26] More recently, in his report to the CAISO Board, CAISO Chief Executive Officer Steve Berberich highlighted the critical need for new and flexible generation capacity:

> While California has adequate capacity at this time, in the next five years there is a potential for a shortfall of flexible resources that can help maintain reliability by quickly ramping up or down to compensate fluctuations in wind and solar power. The amount of shortfall is highly affected by the potential retirements of coastal gas-fired plants required to comply with a new once-through cooling regulation. Under most likely scenarios, the system is still likely to be short several thousand megawatts of ramping capacity.[27]

Second, Governor Brown has announced an initiative to achieve 12,000 MW of distributed generation in California.[28] This initiative raises additional reliability and operational

---

[26] *See http://www.caiso.com/Documents/StrawProposal-FlexibleCapacityProcurement.pdf* ("CAISO Flexible Capacity Proposal") at p. 8.

[27] *See http://www.caiso.com/Documents/CEOReport-MemoMar2012.pdf* ("CEO Report") at p. 2 (emphasis added).

[28] *See* Governor Brown's "Clean Energy Jobs Plan," available at: http://gov.ca.gov/docs/Clean_Energy_Plan.pdf.

concerns and increases the CAISO's need for flexible resources. As the CAISO explained:

> Distributed generation is often behind the meter generation and the ISO cannot dispatch this generation and may not have visibility of the output of these resources. While increased levels of distributed generation may decrease system peaks, it may also increase what appears as load variability on the grid. For example, much of this distributed generation is expected to be photovoltaic installations, which could vary when cloud cover is intermittent, and which will start and stop production in unison as the sun rises and sets. Even with tools to improve the ISO's visibility of these resources, a large increase in distributed generation will likely increase the ISO's need for flexible capacity.[29]

Third, the amount of time needed to develop new generation projects is increasing as a result of stricter Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") requirements and other permitting issues. In recent comments filed in the Commission's LTPP proceeding, the Independent Energy Producers ("IEP") noted that project development for new generation resources now takes between five and eight years.[30] At an all-party hearing attended by Commissioners Florio and Sandoval on March 26, 2012, a representative of GenOn Energy indicated that developing a new generating facility in California now takes between seven and nine years, citing the eight years that it took to develop Calpine's Russell City facility as an example. In short, highly viable, community supported, fully permitted new generating facilities are in short supply and provide unique opportunities to address the increasing reliability needs of California's electric grid.

IV. THE BENEFITS OF THE OAKLEY PROJECT MERIT COMMISSION APPROVAL

A. The Oakley Project Addresses The Reliability Risks And Capacity Constraints Identified By The CAISO and CEC

In the *2011 Integrated Energy Policy Report*, the CEC recognized that "natural gas continues to play an essential role in meeting the state's energy demand" and "helping integrate

---

[29] CAISO Flexible Capacity Proposal at p. 11 (emphasis added).

[30] *Reply Comments of the Independent Energy Producers Association on the proposed Decision on Tracks I and III of the Long-Term Procurement Plan Proceeding*, filed March 19, 2012 at p. 2.

intermittent renewable energy resources into the electricity system." As the *2011 Integrated Energy Policy Report* states, "new natural gas-fired power plants (including combined heat and power plants), combined with energy efficiency, demand response, and central station and distributed renewable generation, will replace [less efficient] existing baseload."[31] In light of these changes, natural gas will be crucial in meeting both system-wide and local capacity requirements.[32]

The CAISO has repeatedly identified a need for flexible gas-fired resources possessing "quick start and significant ramping capability to integrate renewable resources and maintain grid reliability."[33] The Oakley Project was specifically designed for this role and has superior operating characteristics that will facilitate the integration of renewable electricity sources, as discussed above in Section II. Those characteristics, such as quick dispatch capabilities to respond to rapidly changing system conditions, are especially important because renewable resources have an intermittent nature, are not continuously reliable, nor easily scheduled or dispatched. In addition, the Oakley Project is located near the Bay Area load, making it more beneficial to PG&E customers.

The Oakley Project will contain GE's Rapid Response technology to overcome many of the drawbacks inherent in traditional combined-cycle operation. The Rapid Response technology is designed to have improved operational flexibility over conventional combined-cycle power plants, allowing the plant to start up significantly faster than conventional combined-cycle plants. The net result of this new technology is a plant that can start up quickly,

---

[31] *2011 Integrated Energy Policy Report* at p. 86.

[32] *Id.* at p. 124.

[33] *See* CAISO Letter to the CPUC dated February 1, 2010, regarding Applications 09-10-022 and 09-10-034 for approval of contracts with GWF Energy LLC and Calpine Corporation.

similar to a simple cycle peaking gas turbine, but providing firming power to the grid with the efficiency of a combined-cycle plant.

The Oakley Project can also provide key ancillary services and quickly adjust to changing conditions. In particular, the Oakley Project's ability to provide "spinning reserve" and "regulation up or down" as ancillary services is critical to integrating renewable energy sources into the grid. Unlike "non-spinning reserve," these ancillary services require that the plant be operating. Because of the high efficiency of the Oakley Project, it is much more likely to be operating (as compared to a simple-cycle peaking facility) and thus better positioned to provide these services. Furthermore, the Oakley Project has been permitted to accommodate a wide variety of dispatch scenarios including scenarios with high numbers of operating hours and starts. Many existing gas-fired facilities, especially most simple-cycle peakers, do not share the same level of flexibility in their permits.

In sum, the Oakley Project is exactly the kind of flexible, efficient new generation resource needed in California, and the need for resources like the Oakley Project has only increased since December 2010, as evidenced by the recent CAISO studies addressing grid reliability concerns. As the Commission determined when it approved the Oakley Project in December 2010:

> While arguments for and against the Oakley Project have focused on capacity need issues, there are other features of this project which make it a uniquely valuable addition to PG&E's resource mix. As noted by Commissioner Bohn, the Oakley plant "has many beneficial features, including a very high efficiency and low air emission rates, and utilizes the most up to date technology from General Electric." These are exactly the type of attributes the state of California will need to help with renewable integration.[34]

[34] D.10-12-050 at p. 10 (footnotes omitted).

B. The Oakley Project Integrates Renewable Energy Resources and Maintains Grid Reliability

Natural gas power plants also provide a steady supply of power to supplement intermittent renewable resources, like solar and wind power. As the CEC recognized in the *2011 Integrated Energy Policy Report*, "[n]atural gas units can provide quick startup, rapid ramping, regulation, spinning reserves, and energy when intermittent resources are not available."[35] In this regard, the IEPR describes natural gas as a "complementary" technology that can provide "flexible and rapid response for renewable integration."[36] Given California's push towards greater use of renewable resources, new natural gas plants will play a central role in supporting and supplementing the resources provided by renewable technologies.

As California moves towards an increased reliance on renewable energy, the bulk of new renewable generation available to, and used in California, will be intermittent wind and solar generation.[37] To accommodate the increased variability in generation due to increasing renewable penetration, compounded by increasing load variability, control authorities such as the CAISO need increased flexibility from other generation resources, such as fast ramping and fast starting fossil fuel generation resources.[38] The Oakley Project would provide short starting, and

---

[35] *2011 Integrated Energy Policy Report* at 40. For further discussion of gas-fired generation in integrating renewable resources, see *Renewable Power in California: Status and Issues* (Aug. 2011), CEC-150-2011-002, available at http://www.energy.ca.gov/2011publications/CEC-150-2011-002/CEC-150-2011-002-LCF-REV1.pdf.

[36] *Id.* at p. 40.

[37] *See* MRW & Associates, LLC, Fra*mework for Evaluating Greenhouse Gas Implications of Natural Gas-Fired Power Plants in California*, (Dec. 2009), CEC-700-2009-009-F, available at http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CEC-700-2009-009/CEC-700-2009-009-F.pdf ("CEC Report"), at 3; see California Energy Commission, Final Staff Assessment for the Oakley Generating Station, March 2011 ("FSA"), at p. 4.1-85; California Energy Commission, Final Decision, Oakley Generating Station, May 2011 ("Final Decision"), at p. GHG-12.

[38] *See* California Independent System Operator. Integration of Renewable Resources. November 2007; California Independent System Operator. Integration of Renewable Resources. Operational Requirements and Generation Fleet Capability at 20% RPS. August 31, 2010.

fast-ramping power, and a wide range of turndown operation, and was considered fast starting by the CEC because of its ability to come to full load in less than two hours.[39]

The CEC determined that the Oakley Project is likely to serve as an important firming source for intermittent renewable resources in support of California's RPS and GHG goals.[40] The Oakley Project is designed to operate either for reliability, which provides backup and renewable integration purposes, or for base load purposes.[41] Thus, the Oakley Project would be more likely to foster the integration of renewable energy than comparable non-renewable base load or intermediate energy resources.[42]

C. The Oakley Project Displaces Less-Efficient Local Generation Sources, Effectively Reducing Greenhouse Gas And Other Pollutant Emissions

The Oakley Project heat rate is lower than the heat rates of the other peaking and base load generating units in the Greater Bay Area and would thus be more efficient and emit fewer GHG per MWh of generation that those other units.[43] The Oakley Project would effectively reduce GHG emissions and other pollutants associated with those less efficient generating sources.[44] The CEC issued Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law demonstrating the benefits of the Oakley Project, including but not limited to the following:[45]

- When it operates, the Oakley Project will displace generation from less-efficient (i.e., higher-heat-rate and therefore higher-GHG-emitting) power plants in the Greater Bay Area.

---

[39] FSA, at p. 4.1-85.

[40] Final Decision, at p. GHG-12.

[41] FSA, at p. 4.1-86.

[42] *Id.*

[43] Final Decision, at p. GHG-10-11; FSA, at p. 4.1-84.

[44] FSA, at p. 4.1-85.

[45] Final Decision, at p. GHG-13-15.

- Even as more renewable generation is added to the California electricity system, gas-fired power plants such as the Oakley Project will be necessary to meet local capacity requirements and to provide intermittent generation support, grid operations support, extreme load and system emergencies support, and general energy support.

- The Oakley Project's operation will reduce overall GHG emissions from the electricity system.

- Intermittent solar and wind generation will account for most of the installation of renewables in the next few decades. Intermittent generation needs dispatchable generation, such as the Oakley Project, in order to be integrated effectively into the electricity system.

- The Oakley Project's operation will foster the addition of renewable generation into the electricity system, which will further reduce system GHG emissions.

- The Oakley Project's operation will foster the achievement of the GHG goals of Assembly Bill ("AB") 32 and Executive Order S-3-05.

- The Oakley Project will not interfere with generation from existing renewables or with the integration of new renewable generation.

- The Oakley Project will reduce system-wide GHG emissions.

D. The Oakley Project Advances California's Goals To Reduce GHG Emissions

Net GHG emissions for the integrated electric system will decline when new gas-fired power plants such as the Oakley Project are added to: 1) permit the penetration of renewable generation to the 33% target; 2) improve the overall efficiency of the electric system; or 3) serve load growth or capacity needs more efficiently than the existing fleet.[46] The Oakley Project would be consistent with AB 32 and would help advance the shift to a higher-renewable, low-carbon electricity grid.[47]

[46] FSA, at p. 4.1-84.

[47] FSA, at p. 4.1-91-92; CEC Report, at p. 98.

E. The Oakley Project Facilitates Replacement or Retirement of Less-Efficient Generating Sources, Including Certain Facilities Using Once-Through-Cooling

New, dispatchable resources like the Oakley Project would also be required to provide generation capacity (that is, the ability to meet fluctuating, intermittent electricity loads) when facilities utilizing OTC are retired.[48] The State Water Resource Control Board ("SWRCB") has proposed significant changes to OTC units, which would likely require retrofit, retirement, or significant curtailment of dozens of generating units,[49] representing approximately 17,500 MW of capacity. Several of the existing OTC units operate at low capacity factors, suggesting a limited ability to compete in the current electricity market, increasing the likelihood that they would retire.[50] Although the timing would be uncertain, new resources such as the Oakley Project could displace the energy provided by OTC facilities and accelerate the retirements.[51] The Oakley Project would provide improved efficiency and flexibility when compared with these aging and OTC facilities.[52] Given the proposed transmission line connection, the Oakley Project would be located in the Greater Bay Area Local Capacity Area, which is a major load pocket, and as such would provide local reliability support as well as facilitate the retirement of aging and/or OTC power plants.[53]

F. The Oakley Project Is Uniquely Viable

Developing new generation resources in California has always been a challenge and, in

---

[48] *See* May 4, 2010, State Water Resources Control Board's Resolution No. 2010-0020 (Resolution) and adoption of a Policy for the Use of Coastal and Estuarine Waters for Power Plant Cooling.

[49] *See id.*

[50] FSA, 4.1-88.

[51] FSA, 4.1-88.

[52] FSA, 4.1-88.

[53] FSA, at 4.1-91.

recent years, has only gotten more challenging. As IEP and GenOn Energy recently noted, the development timeline for new generating resources has grown even longer in recent years. Moreover, as the Commission noted when it approved the Oakley Project, regulatory lag creates a significant risk to the development of new resources.[54] The Oakley Project is uniquely situated because it is fully permitted and has already commenced construction. Moreover, unlike many other proposed new generating resources, the Oakley Project enjoys broad community support, as well as support from local, state and national officials. This type of support is critical for the successful development of a project, and is rare in California. The Oakley Project is already proceeding with construction and will be ready for commercial operation in 2016, at the same time that many OTC units are retiring and increasing numbers of intermittent renewable resources are coming on-line. The Oakley Project is uniquely viable and well-positioned to address the need for new generating resources in California.

G. The Oakley Project Has Locational Benefits

The site of the Oakley Project is secured on a DuPont property located in Oakley, California. This location is particularly beneficial because of its Bay Area Local Resource Adequacy designation, providing significant value given the Bay Area's resource constraints. The site is also located adjacent to existing gas and electric transmission facilities, obviating the need to build lengthy transmission and gas lines from the site. The gas interconnection point will be at the Antioch terminal, which borders the site to the west. Thus, there will be no new offsite gas pipelines constructed as a result of the Oakley Project. The Oakley Project is also located within 2.4 miles of its electrical interconnection point and will utilize an existing PG&E transmission corridor for transmission line interconnecting the facility with the grid.

[54] D.10-12-050 at pp. 11-12.

Additionally, constructing the plant on a former brownfield industrial site would also avoid new "greenfield" development.

H. The Amended PSA Is Just And Reasonable

The terms and conditions of the Original PSA were largely undisputed in A.09-09-021. The Amended PSA revises the GCAD and some other provisions, but the substance of the PSA is largely unchanged. The Amended PSA includes commercially reasonable terms that protect PG&E and its customers and ensure that PG&E's customers receive the full value of the transaction. With regard to price, the Oakley Project had one of the best market valuations in the 2008 LTRFO and was originally envisioned to be a 2014 project. The Oakley Project absorbed the risk of inflationary increases and other cost increases at no cost to PG&E's customers, making the economics to PG&E and its customers even more compelling.

V. THE COMMISSION SHOULD ADOPT THE RATEMAKING AND COST RECOVERY PROPOSED IN THE SETTLEMENT ADOPTED IN APPLICATION 09-09-021.

In A.09-09-021, PG&E, the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, TURN, the Coalition of California Utility Employees, and California Unions for Reliable Energy submitted a partial settlement that addressed ratemaking and cost recovery issues associated with the Marsh Landing and Oakley Projects. The Commission approved the partial settlement as "just, reasonable, and in the public interest."[55] PG&E proposes that the ratemaking and cost recovery in the partial settlement be adopted in this Application for the Oakley Project, updated only to reflect the 2016 commercial operation date, instead of 2014.

VI. EXPEDITIOUS COMMISSION ACTION IS NECESSARY

The Oakley Project commenced construction in June of 2011 based on the Commission-

[55] D.10-07-045 at p. 50.

approved contract and the completed licensing and environmental permitting process. To achieve the project milestones within the contract and to realize the numerous benefits that will flow to PG&E's customers, it is imperative that the Oakley Project complete construction milestones within the envisioned timeframe. In order to accomplish this, commitments for major equipment and materials must be made by the Oakley Project to mitigate potential inflation risk. CCGS has indicated that they will be unable to do so until a final and non-appealable Commission approval is granted.

VII. COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMMISSION'S RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

A. Summary Of Authorization Requested (Rule 2.1)

PG&E respectfully requests that the Commission issue a decision by October 11, 2012 that:

(1) Approves the Amended PSA between PG&E and CCGS and finds that it is reasonable and in the best interest of customers;

(2) Approves the ratemaking and cost recovery included in the partial settlement approved in D.10-07-045 for the Oakley Project, updated to reflect a 2016 commercial operation date; and,

(3) Grants such other and further relief as the Commission finds just and reasonable.

B. Statutory Authority (Rule 2.1)

PG&E submits this Application pursuant to Public Utilities Code §§ 451, 454, 454.5, and 701 and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

C. Categorization, Hearings, Issues To Be Considered, And Schedule (Rules 2.1(c) and 7.1)

1. Proposed Category

PG&E proposes that this Application be categorized as a ratesetting proceeding.

2. Need For Hearing

PG&E believes that the Commission should approve the Amended PSA without hearings based on the information presented by PG&E in this Application and subsequent written testimony filed consistent with the schedule outlined below. If the Commission determines that hearings are necessary, PG&E has included proposed dates for the hearings in its schedule.

3. Issues To Be Considered

The following issues should be considered in this proceeding:

(1) Should the Amended PSA be approved; and,

(2) Should the partial settlement in D.10-07-045, updated to reflect a 2016 commercial online date, determine the ratemaking and cost recovery for the Amended PSA and the Oakley Project.

4. Proposed Schedule

PG&E proposes the following schedule in order to obtain a final decision on this Application by October 11, 2012:

ACTIVITY	PROPOSED SCHEDULE
Application filed	March 30, 2012
Application Noticed	April 2, 2012
Responses filed	May 2, 2012
PG&E's Reply to Responses	May 4, 2012
Prehearing Conference	May 8, 2012
Scoping Memo Issued	May 11, 2012
PG&E Testimony Filed	May 16, 2012
Intervenor Testimony Filed	June 6, 2012
PG&E Rebuttal Testimony Filed	June 20, 2012

ACTIVITY	PROPOSED SCHEDULE
Hearings (If Needed)	July 2-3, 2012
Post-Hearing Opening Briefs	July 18, 2012
Post-Hearing Reply Briefs	August 2, 2012
Proposed Decision Released	September 11, 2012
Final Decision	October 11, 2012

D. Legal Name And Principal Place Of Business (Rule 2.1(a))

The Applicant's legal name is Pacific Gas and Electric Company. PG&E's principal place of business is 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, California. Its post office address is P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, CA 94120-7422. PG&E is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California.

E. Correspondence And Communication Regarding This Application (Rule 2.1(b))

Correspondence regarding this Application should be directed to PG&E's representatives in this matter, listed below:

Charles Middlekauff
Law Department
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
P.O. Box 7442
San Francisco, CA 94120-7442
Telephone: (415) 973-6971
Facsimile: (415) 973-5520
E-Mail: CRMd@pge.com

Matthew Gonzales
Energy Proceedings
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
P.O. Box 770000
San Francisco, CA 94177-0001
Telephone: (415) 973-8466
Facsimile: (415) 973-3574
E-Mail: MRGg@pge.com

F. Articles of Incorporation (Rule 2.2)

PG&E is, and since October 10, 1905, has been, an operating public utility corporation organized under California law. It is engaged principally in the business of furnishing electric and gas services in California. A certified copy of PG&E's Restated Articles of Incorporation,

effective April 12, 2004, is on record before the Commission in connection with PG&E's Application 04-05-005 filed with the Commission on May 3, 2004. These articles are incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to Rule 2.2 of the Commission's Rules.

G. Balance Sheet And Income Statement (Rule 3.2(a) (1))

PG&E's Fourth Quarter 2011 Consolidated Statements of Income and Consolidated Balance Sheets are provided as Appendix A of this Application.

H. Statement Of Presently Effective Rates And Proposed Increases (Rules 3.2(a) (2) and (a)(3))

PG&E's presently effective rates are set forth in Appendix B of this Application. The proposed changes and the Results of Operations at Proposed Rates are set forth in Appendix C of this Application.

I. Summary Of Earnings (Rules 3.2(a)(5) and 3.2(a)(6))

PG&E's revenues, expenses, rate base and rates of return summary for the recorded year 2010 are set forth in Appendix D of this Application.

J. Most Recent Proxy Statement (Rule 3.2(a)(8))

PG&E's most recent Proxy Statement, dated March 20, 2011, is publicly available at the Securities and Exchange Commission at the following link:

http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1004980/000104746911002875/a2202629zdef14a.htm

This Proxy Statement is incorporated herein by this reference.

K. Type of Rate Change Requested (Rule 3.2(a)(10))

The proposed change reflects changes in PG&E's base revenue to reflect the increased costs to construct, install, and maintain the Oakley Project described in this Application.

L. Type of Rate Change Requested (Rule 3.2(b) – (d))

Within twenty (20) days of filing this Application, PG&E will mail a notice stating in general terms the proposed revenues, rate changes, and ratemaking mechanisms requested in this Application to the parties listed in Appendix E, including the State of California and cities and counties served by PG&E. Within twenty (20) days after the filing of this Application, PG&E will also publish a notice of the proposed increases in rates in a newspaper of general circulation in each county in its service area. That notice will state that a copy of this Application may be examined at the Commission's offices and the PG&E offices specified in the notice. A similar notice will be included in the regular bills mailed to PG&E's customers within forty-five (45) days of the filing date of this Application. PG&E will e-mail a copy of this Application on the service list for the official service lists for A.09-09-021 and R.10-05-006.

//

//

//

//

VIII. RELIEF REQUESTED

PG&E respectfully requests that by no later than October 11, 2012, the Commission issue a final decision:

(1) Approving the Amended PSA between PG&E and CCGS and finds that it is reasonable and in the best interest of customers;

(2) Approving the ratemaking and cost recovery included in the partial settlement approved in D.10-07-045 for the Oakley Project, updated to reflect a 2016 commercial operation date; and,

(3) Granting such other and further relief as the Commission finds just and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

By: */s/ Fong Wan*
FONG WAN
Senior Vice President - Energy Procurement

By: */s/ Charles R. Middlekauff*
CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF

CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, B30A
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 973-6971
Facsimile: (415) 973-5520
E-Mail: CRMd@pge.com

Attorney for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: March 30, 2012

VERIFICATION

I, Fong Wan, say:

I am an officer of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a corporation, and am authorized, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 446, ¶3, to make this Verification for and on behalf of said Corporation, and I make this Verification for that reason. I have read the foregoing Application, and I am informed and believe that the matters therein concerning Pacific Gas and Electric Company are true. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on March 28, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ Fong Wan

FONG WAN

Senior Vice President - Energy Procurement

APPENDIX A

Balance Sheet and Income Statement
Of
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF INCOME
(in millions)

	Year ended December 31,		
	2011	**2010**	**2009**
Operating Revenues			
Electric	$ 11,601	$ 10,644	$ 10,257
Natural gas	3,350	3,196	3,142
Total operating revenues	14,951	13,840	13,399
Operating Expenses			
Cost of electricity	4,016	3,898	3,711
Cost of natural gas	1,317	1,291	1,291
Operating and maintenance	5,459	4,432	4,343
Depreciation, amortization, and decommissioning	2,215	1,905	1,752
Total operating expenses	13,007	11,526	11,097
Operating Income	1,944	2,314	2,302
Interest income	5	9	33
Interest expense	(677)	(650)	(662)
Other income, net	53	22	59
Income Before Income Taxes	1,325	1,695	1,732
Income tax provision	480	574	482
Net Income	845	1,121	1,250
Preferred stock dividend requirement	14	14	14
Income Available for Common Stock	$ 831	$ 1,107	$ 1,236

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS
(in millions)

	Balance at December 31,	
	2011	**2010**
ASSETS		
Current Assets		
Cash and cash equivalents	$ 304	$ 51
Restricted cash ($51 and $38 related to energy recovery bonds at December 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively)	380	563
Accounts receivable		
Customers (net of allowance for doubtful accounts of $81 at December 31, 2011 and 2010)	992	944
Accrued unbilled revenue	763	649
Regulatory balancing accounts	1,082	1,105
Other	840	856
Regulatory assets ($336 and $0 related to energy recovery bonds at December 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively)	1,090	599
Inventories		
Gas stored underground and fuel oil	159	152
Materials and supplies	261	205
Income taxes receivable	242	48
Other	213	190
Total current assets	6,326	5,362
Property, Plant, and Equipment		
Electric	35,851	33,508
Gas	11,931	11,382
Construction work in progress	1,770	1,384
Total property, plant, and equipment	49,552	46,274
Accumulated depreciation	(15,898)	(14,826)
Net property, plant, and equipment	33,654	31,448
Other Noncurrent Assets		
Regulatory assets ($0 and $735 related to energy recovery bonds at December 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively)	6,506	5,846
Nuclear decommissioning trusts	2,041	2,009
Income taxes receivable	384	614
Other	331	400
Total other noncurrent assets	9,262	8,869
TOTAL ASSETS	$ 49,242	$ 45,679

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS
(in millions, except share amounts)

	Balance at December 31,	
	2011	**2010**
LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY		
Current Liabilities		
Short-term borrowings	$ 1,647	$ 853
Long-term debt, classified as current	50	809
Energy recovery bonds, classified as current	423	404
Accounts payable		
Trade creditors	1,177	1,129
Disputed claims and customer refunds	673	745
Regulatory balancing accounts	374	256
Other	417	390
Interest payable	838	857
Income taxes payable	118	116
Deferred income taxes	199	118
Other	1,628	1,349
Total current liabilities	7,544	7,026
Noncurrent Liabilities		
Long-term debt	11,417	10,557
Energy recovery bonds	-	423
Regulatory liabilities	4,733	4,525
Pension and other postretirement benefits	3,325	2,174
Asset retirement obligations	1,609	1,586
Deferred income taxes	6,160	5,659
Other	2,070	2,008
Total noncurrent liabilities	29,314	26,932
Commitments and Contingencies (Note 15)		
Shareholders' Equity		
Preferred stock	258	258
Common stock, $5 par value, authorized 800,000,000 shares, 264,374,809 shares outstanding at December 31, 2011 and 2010	1,322	1,322
Additional paid-in capital	3,796	3,241
Reinvested earnings	7,210	7,095
Accumulated other comprehensive loss	(202)	(195)
Total shareholders' equity	12,384	11,721
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY	$ 49,242	$ 45,679

APPENDIX B

Summary of Earnings
Of
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

RESIDENTIAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE E-1			1
2	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$4.50	$4.50	2
3	ES UNIT DISCOUNT ($/UNIT/MONTH)	($0.70)	($0.70)	3
4	ET UNIT DISCOUNT ($/UNIT/MONTH)	$2.35	$2.35	4
5	ES/ET MINIMUM RATE LIMITER ($/KWH)	$0.04892	$0.04892	5
6	ENERGY ($/KWH)			6
7	TIER 1	$0.12845	$0.12845	7
8	TIER 2	$0.14602	$0.14602	8
9	TIER 3	$0.29940	$0.29940	9
10	TIER 4	$0.33940	$0.33940	10
11	TIER 5	$0.33940	$0.33940	11
12	SCHEDULE EL-1 (CARE)			12
13	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$3.60	$3.60	13
14	ENERGY ($/KWH)			14
15	TIER 1	$0.08316	$0.08316	15
16	TIER 2	$0.09563	$0.09563	16
17	TIER 3	$0.12474	$0.12474	17

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

RESIDENTIAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE E-6 / EM-TOU			1
2	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$4.50	$4.50	2
3	E-6 METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$7.70	$7.70	3
4	ON-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			4
5	TIER 1	$0.27883		5
6	TIER 2	$0.29640		6
7	TIER 3	$0.45032		7
8	TIER 4	$0.49032		8
9	TIER 5	$0.49032		9
10	PART-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			10
11	TIER 1	$0.17017	$0.11776	11
12	TIER 2	$0.18775	$0.13533	12
13	TIER 3	$0.34167	$0.28925	13
14	TIER 4	$0.38167	$0.32925	14
15	TIER 5	$0.38167	$0.32925	15
16	OFF-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			16
17	TIER 1	$0.09781	$0.10189	17
18	TIER 2	$0.11538	$0.11947	18
19	TIER 3	$0.26930	$0.27339	19
20	TIER 4	$0.30930	$0.31339	20
21	TIER 5	$0.30930	$0.31339	21
22	SCHEDULE EL-6 / EML-TOU			22
23	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$3.60	$3.60	23
24	EL-6 METER CHARGE($/MONTH)	$6.16	$6.16	24
25	ON-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			25
26	TIER 1	$0.19655		26
27	TIER 2	$0.21008		27
28	TIER 3	$0.29483		28
29	PART-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			29
30	TIER 1	$0.11451	$0.07494	30
31	TIER 2	$0.12804	$0.08845	31
32	TIER 3	$0.17177	$0.11241	32
33	OFF-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			33
34	TIER 1	$0.05987	$0.06295	34
35	TIER 2	$0.07340	$0.07647	35
36	TIER 3	$0.08981	$0.09443	36

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

RESIDENTIAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE E-7			1
2	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$4.50	$4.50	2
3	E-7 METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$3.51	$3.51	3
4	RATE W METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$1.17	$1.17	4
5	ON-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			5
6	TIER 1	$0.31312	$0.11093	6
7	TIER 2	$0.33128	$0.12909	7
8	TIER 3	$0.48465	$0.28246	8
9	TIER 4	$0.52465	$0.32246	9
10	TIER 5	$0.52465	$0.32246	10
11	OFF-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			11
12	TIER 1	$0.07921	$0.08262	12
13	TIER 2	$0.09737	$0.10078	13
14	TIER 3	$0.25074	$0.25415	14
15	TIER 4	$0.29074	$0.29415	15
16	TIER 5	$0.29074	$0.29415	16
17	SCHEDULE EL-7			17
18	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$4.50	$4.50	18
19	EL-7 METER CHARGE($/MONTH)	$0.00	$0.00	19
20	ON-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			20
21	TIER 1	$0.26813	$0.08913	21
22	TIER 2	$0.28372	$0.10472	22
23	TIER 3	$0.40220	$0.13370	23
24	OFF-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			24
25	TIER 1	$0.06105	$0.06407	25
26	TIER 2	$0.07664	$0.07966	26
27	TIER 3	$0.09158	$0.09611	27
28	SCHEDULE E-8			28
29	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$12.53	$12.53	29
30	ENERGY ($/KWH)			30
31	TIER 1	$0.13270	$0.08497	31
32	TIER 2	$0.13270	$0.08497	32
33	TIER 3	$0.28607	$0.23834	33
34	TIER 4	$0.32607	$0.27834	34
35	TIER 5	$0.32607	$0.27834	35
36	SCHEDULE EL-8 (CARE)			36
37	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$10.02	$10.02	37
38	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			38
39	TIER 1	$0.08624	$0.05234	39
40	TIER 2	$0.08624	$0.05234	40
41	TIER 3	$0.12936	$0.07851	41

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

RESIDENTIAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE E-A7			1
2	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$4.50	$4.50	2
3	E-A7 METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$3.51	$3.51	3
4	RATE Y METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$1.17	$1.17	4
5	ON-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			5
6	TIER 1	$0.34574	$0.11004	6
7	TIER 2	$0.36390	$0.12819	7
8	TIER 3	$0.51727	$0.28157	8
9	TIER 4	$0.55727	$0.32157	9
10	TIER 5	$0.55727	$0.32157	10
11	OFF-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			11
12	TIER 1	$0.07452	$0.08272	12
13	TIER 2	$0.09267	$0.10087	13
14	TIER 3	$0.24605	$0.25425	14
15	TIER 4	$0.28605	$0.29425	15
16	TIER 5	$0.28605	$0.29425	16
17	SCHEDULE EL-A7			17
18	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$4.50	$4.50	18
19	EL-A7 METER CHARGE($/MONTH)	$0.00	$0.00	19
20	ON-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			20
21	TIER 1	$0.29701	$0.08834	21
22	TIER 2	$0.31260	$0.10393	22
23	TIER 3	$0.44552	$0.13251	23
24	OFF-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			24
25	TIER 1	$0.05689	$0.06415	25
26	TIER 2	$0.07248	$0.07974	26
27	TIER 3	$0.08534	$0.09623	27
28	SCHEDULE E-9: RATE A			28
29	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$4.50	$4.50	29
30	E-9 METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$6.66	$6.66	30
31	ON-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			31
32	TIER 1	$0.30178		32
33	TIER 2	$0.31994		33
34	TIER 3	$0.50415		34
35	TIER 4	$0.54415		35
36	TIER 5	$0.54415		36
37	PART-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			37
38	TIER 1	$0.09876	$0.09864	38
39	TIER 2	$0.11692	$0.11679	39
40	TIER 3	$0.30113	$0.30101	40
41	TIER 4	$0.34113	$0.34101	41
42	TIER 5	$0.34113	$0.34101	42
43	OFF-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			43
44	TIER 1	$0.03743	$0.04680	44
45	TIER 2	$0.05559	$0.06495	45
46	TIER 3	$0.16011	$0.16011	46
47	TIER 4	$0.20011	$0.20011	47
48	TIER 5	$0.20011	$0.20011	48

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

RESIDENTIAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE E-9: RATE B			1
2	MINIMUM BILL ($/MONTH)	$4.50	$4.50	2
3	E-9 METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$6.66	$6.66	3
4	ON-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			4
5	TIER 1	$0.29726		5
6	TIER 2	$0.31541		6
7	TIER 3	$0.49962		7
8	TIER 4	$0.53962		8
9	TIER 5	$0.53962		9
10	PART-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			10
11	TIER 1	$0.09424	$0.09462	11
12	TIER 2	$0.11239	$0.11277	12
13	TIER 3	$0.29661	$0.29699	13
14	TIER 4	$0.33661	$0.33699	14
15	TIER 5	$0.33661	$0.33699	15
16	OFF-PEAK ENERGY ($/KWH)			16
17	TIER 1	$0.04479	$0.05339	17
18	TIER 2	$0.06295	$0.07155	18
19	TIER 3	$0.24716	$0.25576	19
20	TIER 4	$0.28716	$0.29576	20
21	TIER 5	$0.28716	$0.29576	21

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

SMALL L&P RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE A-1			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE: SINGLE-PHASE ($/MO.)	$10.00	$10.00	2
3	CUSTOMER CHARGE: POLYPHASE ($/MO.)	$20.00	$20.00	3
4	ENERGY ($/KWH)	$0.20522	$0.14493	4
5	SCHEDULE A-1 TOU			5
6	CUSTOMER CHARGE: SINGLE-PHASE ($/MO.)	$10.00	$10.00	6
7	CUSTOMER CHARGE: POLYPHASE ($/MO.)	$20.00	$20.00	7
8	ENERGY ($/KWH)			8
9	ON-PEAK	$0.21978		9
10	PART-PEAK	$0.21321	$0.15223	10
11	OFF-PEAK ENERGY	$0.19322	$0.13816	11
12	SCHEDULE A-6			12
13	CUSTOMER CHARGE: SINGLE-PHASE ($/MO.)	$10.00	$10.00	13
14	CUSTOMER CHARGE: POLYPHASE ($/MO.)	$20.00	$20.00	14
15	METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$6.12	$6.12	15
16	METER CHARGE - RATE W ($/MONTH)	$1.80	$1.80	16
17	METER CHARGE - RATE X ($/MONTH)	$6.12	$6.12	17
18	ENERGY ($/KWH)			18
19	ON-PEAK	$0.43995		19
20	PART-PEAK	$0.22498	$0.15247	20
21	OFF-PEAK ENERGY	$0.13840	$0.12840	21
22	SCHEDULE A-15			22
23	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$10.00	$10.00	23
24	FACILITY CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$25.00	$25.00	24
25	ENERGY ($/KWH)	$0.20522	$0.14493	25
26	SCHEDULE TC-1			26
27	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$10.00	$10.00	27
28	ENERGY ($/KWH)	$0.14178	$0.14178	28

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

MEDIUM L&P RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE A-10			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$140.00	$140.00	2
3	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MO)			3
4	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$12.15	$5.63	4
5	PRIMARY VOLTAGE	$11.38	$5.84	5
6	TRANSMISSION VOLTAGE	$7.47	$4.13	6
7	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			7
8	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$0.13834	$0.10331	8
9	PRIMARY VOLTAGE	$0.12944	$0.09904	9
10	TRANSMISSION VOLTAGE	$0.10537	$0.08669	10
11	SCHEDULE A-10 TOU			11
12	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$140.00	$140.00	12
13	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MO)			13
14	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$12.15	$5.63	14
15	PRIMARY VOLTAGE	$11.38	$5.84	15
16	TRANSMISSION VOLTAGE	$7.47	$4.13	16
17	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			17
18	SECONDARY			18
19	ON PEAK	$0.15130		19
20	PARTIAL PEAK	$0.14543	$0.11116	20
21	OFF-PEAK	$0.12759	$0.09586	21
22	PRIMARY			22
23	ON PEAK	$0.14026		23
24	PARTIAL PEAK	$0.13607	$0.10545	24
25	OFF-PEAK	$0.12008	$0.09293	25
26	TRANSMISSION			26
27	ON PEAK	$0.11521		27
28	PARTIAL PEAK	$0.11139	$0.09260	28
29	OFF-PEAK	$0.09686	$0.08108	29

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

E-19 FIRM RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE E-19 T FIRM			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE > 500 KW ($/MONTH)	$1,800.00	$1,800.00	2
3	CUSTOMER CHARGE < 500 KW ($/MONTH)	$140.00	$140.00	3
4	TOU METER CHARGE - RATES V & X ($/MONTH)	$5.40	$5.40	4
5	TOU METER CHARGE - RATE W ($/MONTH)	$1.08	$1.08	5
6	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			6
7	ON-PEAK	$12.37		7
8	PARTIAL PEAK	$2.74	$0.00	8
9	MAXIMUM	$5.35	$5.35	9
10	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			10
11	ON-PEAK	$0.08241		11
12	PARTIAL-PEAK	$0.07903	$0.07784	12
13	OFF-PEAK	$0.06725	$0.06850	13
14	SCHEDULE E-19 P FIRM			14
15	CUSTOMER CHARGE > 500 KW ($/MONTH)	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	15
16	CUSTOMER CHARGE < 500 KW ($/MONTH)	$140.00	$140.00	16
17	TOU METER CHARGE - RATES V & X ($/MONTH)	$5.40	$5.40	17
18	TOU METER CHARGE - RATE W ($/MONTH)	$1.08	$1.08	18
19	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			19
20	ON-PEAK	$14.48		20
21	PARTIAL PEAK	$3.15	$0.40	21
22	MAXIMUM	$9.23	$9.23	22
23	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			23
24	ON-PEAK	$0.12433		24
25	PARTIAL-PEAK	$0.09053	$0.08671	25
26	OFF-PEAK	$0.07039	$0.07280	26
27	SCHEDULE E-19 S FIRM			27
28	CUSTOMER CHARGE > 500 KW ($/MONTH)	$600.00	$600.00	28
29	CUSTOMER CHARGE < 500 KW ($/MONTH)	$140.00	$140.00	29
30	TOU METER CHARGE - RATES V & X ($/MONTH)	$5.40	$5.40	30
31	TOU METER CHARGE - RATE W ($/MONTH)	$1.08	$1.08	31
32	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			32
33	ON-PEAK	$14.70		33
34	PARTIAL PEAK	$3.43	$0.21	34
35	MAXIMUM	$11.85	$11.85	35
36	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			36
37	ON-PEAK	$0.13476		37
38	PARTIAL-PEAK	$0.09579	$0.09063	38
39	OFF-PEAK	$0.07028	$0.07320	39

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

E-20 FIRM RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE E-20 T FIRM			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)-FIRM	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	2
3	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			3
4	ON-PEAK	$12.24		4
5	PARTIAL PEAK	$2.65	$0.00	5
6	MAXIMUM	$4.06	$4.06	6
7	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			7
8	ON-PEAK	$0.08981		8
9	PARTIAL-PEAK	$0.07574	$0.07680	9
10	OFF-PEAK	$0.06397	$0.06704	10
11	SCHEDULE E-20 P FIRM			11
12	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	12
13	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			13
14	ON-PEAK	$14.03		14
15	PARTIAL PEAK	$2.99	$0.25	15
16	MAXIMUM	$9.36	$9.36	16
17	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			17
18	ON-PEAK	$0.12350		18
19	PARTIAL-PEAK	$0.09010	$0.08633	19
20	OFF-PEAK	$0.07057	$0.07360	20
21	SCHEDULE E-20 S FIRM			21
22	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	22
23	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			23
24	ON-PEAK	$14.32		24
25	PARTIAL PEAK	$3.15	$0.23	25
26	MAXIMUM	$11.72	$11.72	26
27	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			27
28	ON-PEAK	$0.12421		28
29	PARTIAL-PEAK	$0.09141	$0.08675	29
30	OFF-PEAK	$0.06979	$0.07066	30

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

OIL AND GAS EXTRACTION RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE E-37			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$36.00	$36.00	2
3	TOU METER CHARGE - RATE W ($/MONTH)	$1.20	$1.20	3
4	TOU METER CHARGE - RATE X ($/MONTH)	$6.00	$6.00	4
5	ON PEAK DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MO)	$7.49		5
6	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MO)			6
7	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$11.83	$4.65	7
8	PRIMARY VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$1.29	$0.15	8
9	TRANSMISSION VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$8.88	$4.00	9
10	ENERGY ($/KWH)			10
11	ON-PEAK	$0.16343		11
12	PART-PEAK		$0.08843	12
13	OFF-PEAK	$0.07318	$0.06687	13

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

STANDBY RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE S - TRANSMISSION			1
2	CONTRACT CAPACITY CHARGE ($/KW/MO.)	$0.92	$0.92	2
3	EFFECTIVE RESERVATION CHARGE ($/KW/MO.)	$0.78	$0.78	3
4	ENERGY ($/KWH)			4
5	ON-PEAK	$0.09595		5
6	PART-PEAK	$0.09236	$0.09098	6
7	OFF-PEAK	$0.07871	$0.08015	7
8	SCHEDULE S - PRIMARY			8
9	CONTRACT CAPACITY CHARGE ($/KW/MO.)	$3.03	$3.03	9
10	EFFECTIVE RESERVATION CHARGE ($/KW/MO.)	$2.58	$2.58	10
11	ENERGY ($/KWH)			11
12	ON-PEAK	$0.45501		12
13	PART-PEAK	$0.24566	$0.13015	13
14	OFF-PEAK	$0.16041	$0.10919	14
15	SCHEDULE S - SECONDARY			15
16	CONTRACT CAPACITY CHARGE ($/KW/MO.)	$3.05	$3.05	16
17	EFFECTIVE RESERVATION CHARGE ($/KW/MO.)	$2.59	$2.59	17
18	ENERGY ($/KWH)			18
19	ON-PEAK	$0.45316		19
20	PART-PEAK	$0.24402	$0.13053	20
21	OFF-PEAK	$0.15874	$0.10790	21

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

STANDBY RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE S CUSTOMER AND METER CHARGES			1
2	RESIDENTIAL			2
3	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$5.00	$5.00	3
4	TOU METER CHARGE ($/MO)	$3.90	$3.90	4
5	AGRICULTURAL			5
6	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$16.00	$16.00	6
7	TOU METER CHARGE ($/MO)	$6.00	$6.00	7
8	SMALL LIGHT AND POWER (less than or equal to 50 kW)			8
9	SINGLE PHASE CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$10.00	$10.00	9
10	POLY PHASE CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$20.00	$20.00	10
11	METER CHARGE ($/MO)	$6.12	$6.12	11
12	MEDIUM LIGHT AND POWER (>50 kW, <500 kW)			12
13	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$140.00	$140.00	13
14	METER CHARGE ($/MO)	$5.40	$5.40	14
15	MEDIUM LIGHT AND POWER (>500kW)			15
16	TRANSMISSION CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$1,800.00	$1,800.00	16
17	PRIMARY CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	17
18	SECONDARY CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$600.00	$600.00	18
19	LARGE LIGHT AND POWER (> 1000 kW)			19
20	TRANSMISSION CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	20
21	PRIMARY CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	21
22	SECONDARY CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MO)	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	22
23	REDUCED CUSTOMER CHARGES ($/MO)			23
24	SMALL LIGHT AND PWR ((` < 50 kW)	$14.31	$14.31	24
25	MED LIGHT AND PWR (Res Capacity >50 kW and <500 kW)	$74.87	$74.87	25
26	MED LIGHT AND PWR (Res Capacity > 500 kW and < 1000 kW)	$1,206.88	$1,206.88	26

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

AGRICULTURAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE AG-1A			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$17.30	$17.30	2
3	CONNECTED LOAD CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$6.09	$1.17	3
4	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)	$0.21678	$0.17016	4
5	SCHEDULE AG-RA			5
6	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES A & D ($/MONTH)	$17.30	$17.30	6
7	METER CHARGE - RATE A ($/MONTH)	$6.80	$6.80	7
8	METER CHARGE - RATE D ($/MONTH)	$2.00	$2.00	8
9	CONNECTED LOAD CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$5.44	$0.89	9
10	ENERGY ($/KWH)			10
11	ON-PEAK	$0.40498		11
12	PART-PEAK		$0.14871	12
13	OFF-PEAK	$0.14624	$0.12288	13
14	SCHEDULE AG-VA			14
15	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES A & D ($/MONTH)	$17.30	$17.30	15
16	METER CHARGE - RATE A ($/MONTH)	$6.80	$6.80	16
17	METER CHARGE - RATE D ($/MONTH)	$2.00	$2.00	17
18	CONNECTED LOAD CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$5.46	$0.93	18
19	ENERGY ($/KWH)			19
20	ON-PEAK	$0.37867		20
21	PART-PEAK		$0.14941	21
22	OFF-PEAK	$0.14330	$0.12353	22
23	SCHEDULE AG-4A			23
24	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES A & D ($/MONTH)	$17.30	$17.30	24
25	METER CHARGE - RATE A ($/MONTH)	$6.80	$6.80	25
26	METER CHARGE - RATE D ($/MONTH)	$2.00	$2.00	26
27	CONNECTED LOAD CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$5.42	$0.80	27
28	ENERGY ($/KWH)			28
29	ON-PEAK	$0.31325		29
30	PART-PEAK		$0.14856	30
31	OFF-PEAK	$0.14372	$0.12305	31
32	SCHEDULE AG-5A			32
33	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES A & D ($/MONTH)	$17.30	$17.30	33
34	METER CHARGE - RATE A ($/MONTH)	$6.80	$6.80	34
35	METER CHARGE - RATE D ($/MONTH)	$2.00	$2.00	35
36	CONNECTED LOAD CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$8.77	$1.63	36
37	ENERGY ($/KWH)			37
38	ON-PEAK	$0.23588		38
39	PART-PEAK		$0.12902	39
40	OFF-PEAK	$0.12275	$0.10987	40

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012
AGRICULTURAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE AG-1B			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$23.00	$23.00	2
3	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			3
4	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$9.08	$1.86	4
5	PRIMARY VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$0.94	$0.25	5
6	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)	$0.18725	$0.14738	6
7	SCHEDULE AG-RB			7
8	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES B & E ($/MONTH)	$23.00	$23.00	8
9	METER CHARGE - RATE B ($/MONTH)	$6.00	$6.00	9
10	METER CHARGE - RATE E ($/MONTH)	$1.20	$1.20	10
11	ON-PEAK DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$2.83		11
12	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			12
13	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$7.48	$1.54	13
14	PRIMARY VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$0.62	$0.24	14
15	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			15
16	ON-PEAK	$0.36570		16
17	PART-PEAK		$0.12858	17
18	OFF-PEAK	$0.13657	$0.10878	18
19	SCHEDULE AG-VB			19
20	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES B & E ($/MONTH)	$23.00	$23.00	20
21	METER CHARGE - RATE B ($/MONTH)	$6.00	$6.00	21
22	METER CHARGE - RATE E ($/MONTH)	$1.20	$1.20	22
23	ON-PEAK DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$2.80		23
24	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			24
25	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$7.54	$1.52	25
26	PRIMARY VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$0.67	$0.23	26
27	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			27
28	ON-PEAK	$0.33815		28
29	PART-PEAK		$0.12708	29
30	OFF-PEAK	$0.13325	$0.10752	30

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

AGRICULTURAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE AG-4B			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES B & E ($/MONTH)	$23.00	$23.00	2
3	METER CHARGE - RATE B ($/MONTH)	$6.00	$6.00	3
4	METER CHARGE - RATE E ($/MONTH)	$1.20	$1.20	4
5	ON-PEAK DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$3.82		5
6	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			6
7	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$7.19	$1.66	7
8	PRIMARY VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$0.76	$0.25	8
9	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			9
10	ON-PEAK	$0.21989		10
11	PART-PEAK		$0.12239	11
12	OFF-PEAK	$0.12222	$0.10431	12
13	SCHEDULE AG-4C			13
14	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES C & F ($/MONTH)	$64.80	$64.80	14
15	METER CHARGE - RATE C ($/MONTH)	$6.00	$6.00	15
16	METER CHARGE - RATE F ($/MONTH)	$1.20	$1.20	16
17	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			17
18	ON-PEAK	$9.12		18
19	PART-PEAK	$1.75	$0.42	19
20	MAXIMUM	$3.79	$1.84	20
21	PRIMARY VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$1.00	$0.23	21
22	TRANSMISSION VOLTAGE DISCOUNT			22
23	ON-PEAK	$4.79		23
24	PART-PEAK	$0.99	$0.42	24
25	MAXIMUM	$0.18	$1.28	25
26	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			26
27	ON-PEAK	$0.20361		27
28	PART-PEAK	$0.12259	$0.10352	28
29	OFF-PEAK	$0.09423	$0.09090	29
30	SCHEDULE AG-5B			30
31	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES B & E ($/MONTH)	$36.00	$36.00	31
32	METER CHARGE - RATE B ($/MONTH)	$6.00	$6.00	32
33	METER CHARGE - RATE E ($/MONTH)	$1.20	$1.20	33
34	ON-PEAK DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)	$7.49		34
35	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			35
36	SECONDARY VOLTAGE	$11.83	$4.65	36
37	PRIMARY VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$1.29	$0.15	37
38	TRANSMISSION VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$8.88	$4.00	38
39	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			39
40	ON-PEAK	$0.16343		40
41	PART-PEAK		$0.08843	41
42	OFF-PEAK	$0.07318	$0.06687	42

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

AGRICULTURAL RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE AG-5C			1
2	CUSTOMER CHARGE - RATES C & F ($/MONTH)	$160.00	$160.00	2
3	METER CHARGE - RATE C ($/MONTH)	$6.00	$6.00	3
4	METER CHARGE - RATE F ($/MONTH)	$1.20	$1.20	4
5	DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MONTH)			5
6	ON-PEAK	$12.61		6
7	PART-PEAK	$2.63	$0.68	7
8	MAXIMUM	$4.58	$2.86	8
9	PRIMARY VOLTAGE DISCOUNT	$1.86	$0.19	9
10	TRANSMISSION VOLTAGE DISCOUNT			10
11	ON-PEAK	$7.90		11
12	PART-PEAK	$1.19	$0.68	12
13	MAXIMUM	$2.60	$1.88	13
14	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			14
15	ON-PEAK	$0.12605		15
16	PART-PEAK	$0.08792	$0.07798	16
17	OFF-PEAK	$0.07372	$0.07152	17
18	SCHEDULE AG-ICE			18
19	CUSTOMER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$40.00	$40.00	19
20	METER CHARGE ($/MONTH)	$6.00	$6.00	20
21	ON-PEAK DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MO)	$2.95		21
22	MAXIMUM DEMAND CHARGE ($/KW/MO)			22
23	SECONDARY	$3.80	$0.00	23
24	PRIMARY	$3.19	$0.00	24
25	TRANSMISSION	$1.77	$0.00	25
26	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)			26
27	ON-PEAK	$0.12059		27
28	PART-PEAK	$0.09405	$0.09647	28
29	OFF-PEAK	$0.04823	$0.04823	29

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

STREETLIGHTING RATES

LINE NO.		3/1/12 RATES SUMMER	3/1/12 RATES WINTER	LINE NO.
1	SCHEDULE LS-1			1
2	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)	$0.12792	$0.12792	2
3	SCHEDULE LS-2			3
4	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)	$0.12792	$0.12792	4
5	SCHEDULE LS-3			5
6	SERVICE CHARGE ($/METER/MO.)	$6.00	$6.00	6
7	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)	$0.12792	$0.12792	7
8	SCHEDULE OL-1			8
9	ENERGY CHARGE ($/KWH)	$0.13703	$0.13703	9

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012
ELECTRIC RATES FOR SCHEDULES LS-1, LS-2 AND OL-1

NOMINAL LAMP RATINGS			ALL NIGHT RATES PER LAMP PER MONTH									HALF-HOUR ADJ.	
	AVERAGE		SCHEDULE LS-2		SCHEDULE LS-1							LS-1 &	
LAMP WATTS	kWhr PER MONTH	INITIAL LUMENS	A	C	A	B	C	D	E	F	F.1	OL-1	LS-2	OL-1
MERCURY VAPOR LAMPS														
40	18	1,300	$2.509	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.105	--
50	22	1,650	$3.020	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.128	--
100	40	3,500	$5.323	$7.499	$11.487	--	$9.760	--	--	--	--	--	$0.233	--
175	68	7,500	$8.905	$11.081	$15.069	$13.271	$13.342	--	$15.554	$16.608	#REF!	$15.688	$0.395	$0.424
250	97	11,000	$12.614	$14.790	$18.778	$16.980	$17.051	--	--	--	--	--	$0.564	--
400	152	21,000	$19.650	$21.826	$25.814	$24.016	$24.087	--	--	--	--	$27.199	$0.884	$0.947
700	266	37,000	$34.233	$36.409	$40.397	$38.599	$38.670	--	--	--	--	--	$1.547	--
1,000	377	57,000	$48.432	$50.608	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$2.192	--
INCANDESCENT LAMPS														
58	20	600	$2.764	--	$8.928	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.116	--
92	31	1,000	$4.172	$6.348	$10.336	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.180	--
189	65	2,500	$8.521	$10.697	$14.685	$12.887	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.378	--
295	101	4,000	$13.126	$15.302	$19.290	$17.492	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.587	--
405	139	6,000	$17.987	$20.163	$24.151	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.808	--
620	212	10,000	$27.325	$29.501	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$1.233	--
860	294	15,000	$37.814	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$1.709	--
LOW PRESSURE SODIUM VAPOR LAMPS														
35	21	4,800	$2.892	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.122	--
55	29	8,000	$3.916	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.169	--
90	45	13,500	$5.962	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.262	--
135	62	21,500	$8.137	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.361	--
180	78	33,000	$10.184	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.454	--

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012
ELECTRIC RATES FOR SCHEDULES LS-1, LS-2 AND OL-1

NOMINAL LAMP RATINGS			ALL NIGHT RATES PER LAMP PER MONTH									HALF-HOUR ADJ.	
	AVERAGE		SCHEDULE LS-2		SCHEDULE LS-1							LS-1 &	
LAMP WATTS	kWhr PER MONTH	INITIAL LUMENS	A	C	A	B	C	D	E	F	F.1	OL-1	LS-2	OL-1
HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM VAPOR LAMPS														
AT 120 VOLTS														
35	15	2,150	$2.125	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.087	--
50	21	3,800	$2.892	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.122	--
70	29	5,800	$3.916	$6.092	$10.080	--	$8.353	$10.953	$10.565	$11.619	#REF!	$10.344	$0.169	$0.181
100	41	9,500	$5.451	$7.627	$11.615	--	$9.888	$12.488	$12.100	$13.154	#REF!	$11.988	$0.238	$0.255
150	60	16,000	$7.881	$10.057	$14.045	--	$12.318	$14.918	$14.530	$15.584	#REF!	--	$0.349	--
200	80	22,000	$10.440	--	$16.604	--	$14.877	$17.477	$17.089	$18.143	#REF!	--	$0.465	--
250	100	26,000	$12.998	--	$19.162	--	$17.435	$20.035	$19.647	$20.701	#REF!	--	$0.581	--
400	154	46,000	$19.906	--	$26.070	--	$24.343	$26.943	$26.555	$27.609	#REF!	--	$0.895	--
AT 240 VOLTS														
50	24	3,800	$3.276	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.140	--
70	34	5,800	$4.555	$6.731	$10.719	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.198	--
100	47	9,500	$6.218	$8.394	$12.382	--	$10.655	--	$12.867	$13.921	#REF!	--	$0.273	--
150	69	16,000	$9.032	$11.208	$15.196	--	$13.469	--	$15.681	$16.735	#REF!	--	$0.401	--
200	81	22,000	$10.568	$12.744	$16.732	--	$15.005	--	$17.217	$18.271	#REF!	$17.469	$0.471	$0.505
250	100	25,500	$12.998	$15.174	$19.162	--	$17.435	--	$19.647	$20.701	#REF!	$20.073	$0.581	$0.623
310	119	37,000	$15.428	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.692	--
360	144	45,000	$18.626	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.837	--
400	154	46,000	$19.906	$22.082	$26.070	--	$24.343	--	$26.555	$27.609	#REF!	$27.473	$0.895	$0.959
METAL HALIDE LAMPS														
70	30	5,500	$4.044	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.174	--
100	41	8,500	$5.451	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.238	--
150	63	13,500	$8.265	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.366	--
175	72	14,000	$9.416	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.419	--
250	105	20,500	$13.638	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.611	--
400	162	30,000	$20.929	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.942	--
1,000	387	90,000	$49.711	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$2.250	--
INDUCTION LAMPS														
23	9	1,840	$1.357										$0.052	
35	13	2,450	$1.869										$0.076	
40	14	2,200	$1.997	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.081	--
50	18	3,500	$2.509										$0.105	
55	19	3,000	$2.636	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.110	--
65	24	5,525	$3.276										$0.140	
70	27	6,500	$3.660										$0.157	
80	28	4,500	$3.788	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.163	--
85	30	4,800	$4.044	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.174	--
100	36	8,000	$4.811										$0.209	
120	42	8,500	$5.516	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.241	--
135	48	9,450	$6.346										$0.279	
150	51	10,900	$6.730	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.297	--
165	58	12,000	$7.625	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	$0.337	--
200	72	19,000	$9.416										$0.419	

Energy Rate @ $0.12792 per kwh LS-1 & LS-2
$0.13703 per kwh OL-1

Pole Painting Charge @ $0.000 Per Pole Per Month

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES FOR LIGHT EMITTING DIODE (LED) LAMPS

NOMINAL LAMP RATINGS		ALL NIGHT RATES PER LAMP PER MONTH	HALF-HOUR ADJUSTMENT	ALL NIGHT RATES PER LAMP PER MONTH			
Lamp Watts	Average kWh Per Month	LS-2A	LS-1A, C, E, F & LS-2A	LS-1A	LS-1C	LS-1E	LS-1F
0.0-5.0	0.9	$0.321	$0.005	$6.485	$4.758	$6.970	$8.024
5.1-10.0	2.6	$0.539	$0.015	$6.703	$4.976	$7.188	$8.242
10.1-15.0	4.3	$0.756	$0.025	$6.920	$5.193	$7.405	$8.459
15.1-20.0	6.0	$0.974	$0.035	$7.138	$5.411	$7.623	$8.677
20.1-25.0	7.7	$1.191	$0.045	$7.355	$5.628	$7.840	$8.894
25.1-30.0	9.4	$1.408	$0.055	$7.572	$5.845	$8.057	$9.111
30.1-35.0	11.1	$1.626	$0.065	$7.790	$6.063	$8.275	$9.329
35.1-.40.0	12.8	$1.843	$0.074	$8.007	$6.280	$8.492	$9.546
40.1-45.0	14.5	$2.061	$0.084	$8.225	$6.498	$8.710	$9.764
45.1-50.0	16.2	$2.278	$0.094	$8.442	$6.715	$8.927	$9.981
50.1-55.0	17.9	$2.496	$0.104	$8.660	$6.933	$9.145	$10.199
55.1-60.0	19.6	$2.713	$0.114	$8.877	$7.150	$9.362	$10.416
60.1-65.0	21.4	$2.943	$0.124	$9.107	$7.380	$9.592	$10.646
65.1-70.0	23.1	$3.161	$0.134	$9.325	$7.598	$9.810	$10.864
70.1-75.0	24.8	$3.378	$0.144	$9.542	$7.815	$10.027	$11.081
75.1-80.0	26.5	$3.596	$0.154	$9.760	$8.033	$10.245	$11.299
80.1-85.0	28.2	$3.813	$0.164	$9.977	$8.250	$10.462	$11.516
85.1-90.0	29.9	$4.031	$0.174	$10.195	$8.468	$10.680	$11.734
90.1-95.0	31.6	$4.248	$0.184	$10.412	$8.685	$10.897	$11.951
95.1-100.0	33.3	$4.466	$0.194	$10.630	$8.903	$11.115	$12.169
100.1-105.1	35.0	$4.683	$0.204	$10.847	$9.120	$11.332	$12.386
105.1-110.0	36.7	$4.901	$0.213	$11.065	$9.338	$11.550	$12.604
110.1-115.0	38.4	$5.118	$0.223	$11.282	$9.555	$11.767	$12.821
115.1-120.0	40.1	$5.336	$0.233	$11.500	$9.773	$11.985	$13.039
120.1-125.0	41.9	$5.566	$0.244	$11.730	$10.003	$12.215	$13.269
125.1-130.0	43.6	$5.783	$0.254	$11.947	$10.220	$12.432	$13.486
130.1-135.0	45.3	$6.001	$0.263	$12.165	$10.438	$12.650	$13.704
135.1-140.0	47.0	$6.218	$0.273	$12.382	$10.655	$12.867	$13.921
140.1-145.0	48.7	$6.436	$0.283	$12.600	$10.873	$13.085	$14.139
145.1-150.0	50.4	$6.653	$0.293	$12.817	$11.090	$13.302	$14.356
150.1-155.0	52.1	$6.871	$0.303	$13.035	$11.308	$13.520	$14.574
155.1-160.0	53.8	$7.088	$0.313	$13.252	$11.525	$13.737	$14.791
160.1-165.0	55.5	$7.306	$0.323	$13.470	$11.743	$13.955	$15.009
165.1-170.0	57.2	$7.523	$0.333	$13.687	$11.960	$14.172	$15.226
170.1-175.0	58.9	$7.740	$0.342	$13.904	$12.177	$14.389	$15.443
175.1-180.0	60.6	$7.958	$0.352	$14.122	$12.395	$14.607	$15.661
180.1-185.0	62.4	$8.188	$0.363	$14.352	$12.625	$14.837	$15.891
185.1-190.0	64.1	$8.406	$0.373	$14.570	$12.843	$15.055	$16.109
190.1-195.0	65.8	$8.623	$0.383	$14.787	$13.060	$15.272	$16.326

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
AS OF MARCH 1, 2012

PRESENT ELECTRIC RATES FOR LIGHT EMITTING DIODE (LED) LAMPS

NOMINAL LAMP RATINGS		ALL NIGHT RATES PER LAMP PER MONTH	HALF-HOUR ADJUSTMENT	ALL NIGHT RATES PER LAMP PER MONTH			
Lamp Watts	Average kWh Per Month	LS-2A	LS-1A, C, E, F & LS-2A	LS-1A	LS-1C	LS-1E	LS-1F
195.1-200.0	67.5	$8.841	$0.393	$15.005	$13.278	$15.490	$16.544
200.1-205.0	69.2	$9.058	$0.402	$15.222	$13.495	$15.707	$16.761
205.1-210.0	70.9	$9.276	$0.412	$15.440	$13.713	$15.925	$16.979
210.1-215.0	72.6	$9.493	$0.422	$15.657	$13.930	$16.142	$17.196
215.1-220.0	74.3	$9.710	$0.432	$15.874	$14.147	$16.359	$17.413
220.1-225.0	76.0	$9.928	$0.442	$16.092	$14.365	$16.577	$17.631
225.1-230.0	77.7	$10.145	$0.452	$16.309	$14.582	$16.794	$17.848
230.1-235.0	79.4	$10.363	$0.462	$16.527	$14.800	$17.012	$18.066
235.1-240.0	81.1	$10.580	$0.472	$16.744	$15.017	$17.229	$18.283
240.1-245.0	82.9	$10.811	$0.482	$16.975	$15.248	$17.460	$18.514
245.1-250.0	84.6	$11.028	$0.492	$17.192	$15.465	$17.677	$18.731
250.1-255.0	86.3	$11.245	$0.502	$17.409	$15.682	$17.894	$18.948
255.1-260.0	88.0	$11.463	$0.512	$17.627	$15.900	$18.112	$19.166
260.1-265.0	89.7	$11.680	$0.522	$17.844	$16.117	$18.329	$19.383
265.1-270.0	91.4	$11.898	$0.531	$18.062	$16.335	$18.547	$19.601
270.1-275.0	93.1	$12.115	$0.541	$18.279	$16.552	$18.764	$19.818
275.1-280.0	94.8	$12.333	$0.551	$18.497	$16.770	$18.982	$20.036
280.1-285.0	96.5	$12.550	$0.561	$18.714	$16.987	$19.199	$20.253
285.1-290.0	98.2	$12.768	$0.571	$18.932	$17.205	$19.417	$20.471
290.1-295.0	99.9	$12.985	$0.581	$19.149	$17.422	$19.634	$20.688
295.1-300.0	101.6	$13.203	$0.591	$19.367	$17.640	$19.852	$20.906
300.1-305.0	103.4	$13.433	$0.601	$19.597	$17.870	$20.082	$21.136
305.1-310.0	105.1	$13.650	$0.611	$19.814	$18.087	$20.299	$21.353
310.1-315.0	106.8	$13.868	$0.621	$20.032	$18.305	$20.517	$21.571
315.1-320.0	108.5	$14.085	$0.631	$20.249	$18.522	$20.734	$21.788
320.1-325.0	110.2	$14.303	$0.641	$20.467	$18.740	$20.952	$22.006
325.1-330.0	111.9	$14.520	$0.651	$20.684	$18.957	$21.169	$22.223
330.1-335.0	113.6	$14.738	$0.661	$20.902	$19.175	$21.387	$22.441
335.1-340.0	115.3	$14.955	$0.670	$21.119	$19.392	$21.604	$22.658
340.1-345.0	117.0	$15.173	$0.680	$21.337	$19.610	$21.822	$22.876
345.1-350.0	118.7	$15.390	$0.690	$21.554	$19.827	$22.039	$23.093
350.1-355.0	120.4	$15.608	$0.700	$21.772	$20.045	$22.257	$23.311
355.1-360.0	122.1	$15.825	$0.710	$21.989	$20.262	$22.474	$23.528
360.1-365.0	123.9	$16.055	$0.720	$22.219	$20.492	$22.704	$23.758
365.1-370.0	125.6	$16.273	$0.730	$22.437	$20.710	$22.922	$23.976
370.1-375.0	127.3	$16.490	$0.740	$22.654	$20.927	$23.139	$24.193
375.1-380.0	129.0	$16.708	$0.750	$22.872	$21.145	$23.357	$24.411
380.1-385.0	130.7	$16.925	$0.760	$23.089	$21.362	$23.574	$24.628
385.1-390.0	132.4	$17.143	$0.770	$23.307	$21.580	$23.792	$24.846
390.1-395.0	134.1	$17.360	$0.780	$23.524	$21.797	$24.009	$25.063
395.1-400.0	135.8	$17.578	$0.790	$23.742	$22.015	$24.227	$25.281

APPENDIX C

Results of Operations at Proposed Rates

Electric Department Projected Rate Changes by Class
(Dollars in Thousands)

Class and Service	2012 Current Revenues	2016 Proposed Revenues	2016 Proposed Revenue Change	2012 to 2016 Percent Change
Bundled Service*				
Residential	**$5,167,681**	**$5,260,610**	**$92,929**	**1.8%**
Small Commercial	**$1,620,575**	**$1,647,437**	**$26,862**	**1.7%**
Medium Commercial	**$1,391,559**	**$1,419,313**	**$27,754**	**2.0%**
Large Commercial	**$1,553,575**	**$1,585,910**	**$32,335**	**2.1%**
Streetlights	**$72,389**	**$73,542**	**$1,153**	**1.6%**
Standby	**$50,771**	**$51,692**	**$921**	**1.8%**
Agriculture	**$781,890**	**$795,333**	**$13,443**	**1.7%**
Large Industrial	**$1,151,617**	**$1,178,203**	**$26,585**	**2.3%**
Total Bundled Change	**$11,790,058**	**$12,012,039**	**$221,982**	**1.9%**
Direct Access and Community Choice Aggregation Service**				
Residential	**$28,933**	**$29,079**	**$146**	**0.5%**
Small Commercial	**$13,546**	**$13,546**	**$**	**0.0%**
Medium Commercial	**$85,607**	**$85,607**	**$**	**0.0%**
Large Commercial	**$228,556**	**$228,556**	**$**	**0.0%**
Standby	**$651**	**$651**	**$**	**0.0%**
Agriculture	**$3,135**	**$3,135**	**$**	**0.0%**
Large Industrial	**$247,445**	**$247,445**	**$**	**0.0%**
Total Direct Access Change	**$607,872**	**$608,018**	**$146**	**0.0%**

* Customers who receive electric generation as well as transmission and distribution service from PG&E.
**Customers who purchase energy from non-PGE suppliers.

The bill for a typical bundled customer using 550 kWh per month would increase $1.32, or 1.5 percent, from $89.73 to $91.05. The bill for a typical bundled customer using approximately twice the average baseline allowance, or 850 kWh per month, would increase $5.24, or 2.8 percent, from $185.92 to $191.16 per month. Individual customer bills may differ.

APPENDIX D

Statement of Earnings

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
ALL OPERATING DEPARTMENTS
REVENUES, EXPENSES, RATE BASES AND RATES OF RETURN
YEAR 2010 RECORDED
ADJUSTED FOR RATEMAKING
(000$)

Line No.		Electric Operations	Gas Operations	Total Utility Operations
1	**Operating Revenue**	10,272,443	3,341,762	13,614,205
2	Operation Expenses	6,199,632	2,187,052	8,386,685
3	Maintenance Expenses	600,193	141,615	741,808
4	Depreciation Expense	1,003,133	337,696	1,340,829
5	Amort & Depletion of Utility Plant	139,785	34,667	174,452
6	Regulatory Debits	0	0	0
7	(Less) Regulatory Credits	0	0	0
8	Taxes Other Than Income Taxes	286,256	78,601	364,858
9	Federal Income Taxes	506,609	153,970	660,579
10	State Income Taxes	71,736	37,977	109,713
11	(Less) Gains from Disp of Utility Plant	(1,190)	(351)	(1,541)
12	Losses from Utility Plant	0	0	0
13	(Less) Gains from Disposition Utility Plant	(18)	0	(18)
14	**Operating Income**	1,466,307	370,534	1,836,840
15	Weighted Average Rate Base	16,721,231	4,531,858	21,253,089
16	**Rate of Return**	**8.77%**	**8.18%**	**8.64%**

APPENDIX E

Service of Notice of Application

SERVICE OF NOTICE OF APPLICATION

In accordance with Rule 3.2(b), Applicant will mail a notice to the following, stating in general terms its proposed change in rates.

State of California

To the Attorney General and the Department of General Services.

State of California
Office of Attorney General
1300 I St Ste 1101
Sacramento, CA 95814

and

Department of General Services
Office of Buildings & Grounds
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2012
San Francisco, CA 94102

Counties

To the County Counsel or District Attorney and the County Clerk in the following counties:

Alameda
Alpine
Amador
Butte
Calaveras
Colusa
Contra Costa
El Dorado
Fresno
Glenn
Humboldt
Kern
Kings
Lake
Lassen
Madera
Marin
Mariposa
Mendocino
Merced
Modoc
Monterey
Napa
Nevada
Placer
Plumas
Sacramento
San Benito
San Bernardino
San Francisco
San Joaquin
San Luis Obispo
San Mateo
Santa Barbara
Santa Clara
Santa Cruz
Shasta
Sierra
Siskiyou
Solano
Sonoma
Stanislaus
Sutter
Tehama
Trinity
Tulare
Tuolumne
Yolo
Yuba

Municipal Corporations

To the City Attorney and the City Clerk of the following municipal corporations:

Alameda
Albany
Amador City
American Canyon
Anderson
Angels
Antioch
Arcata
Arroyo Grande
Arvin
Atascadero
Atherton
Atwater
Auburn
Avenal
Bakersfield
Barstow
Belmont
Belvedere
Benicia
Berkeley
Biggs
Blue Lake
Brentwood
Brisbane
Buellton
Burlingame
Calistoga
Campbell
Capitola
Carmel
Ceres
Chico
Chowchilla
Citrus Heights
Clayton
Clearlake
Cloverdale
Clovis
Coalinga
Colfax
Colma
Colusa
Concord
Corcoran
Corning
Corte Madera
Cotati
Cupertino
Daly City
Danville
Davis
Del Rey Oakes
Dinuba
Dixon
Dos Palos
Dublin
East Palo Alto
El Cerrito
Elk Grove
Emeryville
Escalon
Eureka
Fairfax
Fairfield
Ferndale
Firebaugh
Folsom
Fort Bragg
Fortuna
Foster City
Fowler
Fremont
Fresno
Galt
Gilroy
Gonzales
Grass Valley
Greenfield
Gridley
Grover Beach
Guadalupe
Gustine
Half Moon Bay
Hanford
Hayward
Healdsburg
Hercules
Hillsborough
Hollister
Hughson
Huron
Ione
Isleton
Jackson
Kerman
King City
Kingsburg
Lafayette
Lakeport
Larkspur
Lathrop
Lemoore
Lincoln
Live Oak
Livermore
Livingston
Lodi
Lompoc
Loomis
Los Altos
Los Altos Hills
Los Banos
Los Gatos
Madera
Manteca
Maricopa
Marina
Martinez
Marysville
McFarland
Mendota
Menlo Park
Merced
Mill Valley
Millbrae
Milpitas
Modesto
Monte Sereno

Monterey
Moraga
Morgan Hill
Morro Bay
Mountain View
Napa
Newark
Nevada City
Newman
Novato
Oakdale
Oakland
Oakley
Orange Cove
Orinda
Orland
Oroville
Pacific Grove
Pacifica
Palo Alto
Paradise
Parlier
Paso Robles
Patterson
Petaluma
Piedmont
Pinole
Pismo Beach
Pittsburg
Placerville
Pleasant Hill
Pleasanton
Plymouth
Point Arena
Portola
Portola Valley
Rancho Cordova
Red Bluff
Redding
Redwood City
Reedley
Richmond
Ridgecrest
Rio Dell
Rio Vista
Ripon
Riverbank
Rocklin
Rohnert Park
Roseville
Ross
Sacramento
Saint Helena
Salinas
San Anselmo
San Bruno
San Carlos
San Francisco
San Joaquin
San Jose
San Juan Bautista
San Leandro
San Luis Obispo
San Mateo
San Pablo
San Rafael
San Ramon
Sand City
Sanger
Santa Clara
Santa Cruz
Santa Maria
Santa Rosa
Saratoga
Sausalito
Scotts Valley
Seaside
Sebastopol
Selma
Shafter
Shasta Lake
Soledad
Solvang
Sonoma
Sonora
South San Francisco
Stockton
Suisun City
Sunnyvale
Sutter Creek
Taft
Tehama
Tiburon
Tracy
Trinidad
Turlock
Ukiah
Union City
Vacaville
Vallejo
Victorville
Walnut Creek
Wasco
Waterford
Watsonville
West Sacramento
Wheatland
Williams
Willits
Willows
Windsor
Winters
Woodland
Woodside
Yountville
Yuba City