

From: Skopec, Dan
Sent: 7/10/2013 4:47:06 PM
To: Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC); russell.garwacki@sce.com (russell.garwacki@sce.com); 'Matthew Freedman' (matthew@turn.org)
Cc: Michael Campbell (Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov); Linda Serizawa (linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Rate reform discussion -- application of fixed charge cap to optional rate schedules

We could live with it if you put back the “intended to serve customers with low or moderate demand.”

*Dan Skopec
Vice President, Regulatory & Legislative Affairs
Sempra Energy Utilities
(415) 202-9986
San Francisco, CA 94102*

From: Matthew Freedman [mailto:matthew@turn.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2013 4:10 PM
To: Trina Horner; Russell.Garwacki@sce.com; Skopec, Dan
Cc: Michael Campbell; Linda Serizawa
Subject: Rate reform discussion -- application of fixed charge cap to optional rate schedules

IOU folks,

I've just spoken with DRA and we can live with the following revision to the language regarding the application of a fixed charge cap to optional rate schedules:

The CPUC may authorize total residential fixed charges of no greater than \$10 per month for non-CARE customers and \$5 per month for CARE customers. This provision shall apply to any default rate schedule, ~~any flat or tiered rate schedule,~~ and at least one optional tiered rate schedule, and at least one optional time variant rate schedule. ~~intended to serve customers with low or moderate demand.~~

In case the editing isn't clear in email, here's how the clean version would read:

The CPUC may authorize total residential fixed charges of no greater than \$10 per month for non-CARE customers and \$5 per month for CARE customers. This provision shall apply to any default rate schedule, at least one optional tiered rate schedule, and at least one optional time variant rate schedule.

Does this work for everyone?

Matthew Freedman

Staff Attorney

The Utility Reform Network

matthew@turn.org

415-954-8084

