From: Skopec, Dan

Sent: 7/10/2013 4:57:13 PM

To: 'russell.garwacki@sce.com' (russell.garwacki@sce.com)

Cc: Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);

'Matthew Freedman' (matthew@turn.org); 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

Agreed. This language gives us the flexibility to tailor those offerings to low and moderate demand customers.

SDG&E is good.

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

From: Russell.Garwacki@sce.com [mailto:Russell.Garwacki@sce.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2013 4:52 PM

To: Skopec, Dan

Cc: Linda Serizawa; 'Matthew Freedman'; Michael Campbell; Trina Horner

Subject: RE: Rate reform discussion -- application of fixed charge cap to optional rate schedules

I wouldn't think that limitation is critical and could be part of the IOU proposal when filed.

In the interest of time. . . . we'll need to get this routed to Sac folks tonight with caveats that TURN et al are co-reviewing it but there are no surprises(it's been converted to leg amendment mode). they're already very grumpy at what was supposed to be there on Monday.

Russ Garwacki Director - Pricing Design and Research SCE Regulatory Operations (626) 302-6673, PAX 26673 From: "Skopec, Dan" < DSkopec@semprautilities.com>

To: "Matthew Freedman" < matthew@turn.org>, Trina Horner < TNHc@pge.com>, "Russell.Garwacki@sce.com"

<<u>Russell.Garwacki@sce.com</u>>,

Cc: Michael Campbell < Michael. Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov > , Linda Serizawa < linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov >

Date: 07/10/2013 04:47 PM

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 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 time variant rate schedule.

Does this work for everyone?

Matthew Freedman Staff Attorney The Utility Reform Network matthew@turn.org 415-954-8084

