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AMENDED SUMMER 2014 RATE REFORM POLICY

## A. Introduction

The purpose of my testimony is to summarize Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG\&E) amended summer 2014 residential electric rate reform proposal in Phase 2 of this proceeding, and to demonstrate that the proposal will provide modest, yet appreciable benefits to those upper tier-consuming households currently burdened by high electric rates and better align rates with basic rate design principles, consistent with PG\&E's overall proposal to reform its residential electric rate structure. 1 My testimony also demonstrates that PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal is consistent with recently enacted Assembly Bill (AB) 327 and the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC or Commission) rate design principles. Although the guidelines provided in the January 24 Amended Scoping Memo for this amended summer 2014 rate proposal limit the degree of progress necessary to more fully effect the intent of AB 327 (by moving important structural reforms to Phase 1 of this proceeding for rates effective in 2015 and beyond), prompt adoption of PG\&E's interim proposals for summer 2014 is an important initial step in that process. PG\&E considers its proposals made here in Phase 2 of this Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) as interim proposals, since the CPUC has indicated that PG\&E should make a subsequent OIR Phase 1 filing on February 28, 2014, ${ }^{2}$ in

[^0]which PG\&E will make longer term rate reform proposals that would impact the residential rate structure for 2015 and beyond.

## B. PG\&E's Amended Summer 2014 Rate Reform Proposal

Since the energy crisis ended 13 years ago, residential electric rates in California have moved far from basic rate design principles, including the key principles that rates should be based on cost to serve and should be understandable to customers. This is simply unsustainable.

PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal will take an important step to begin to implement electric rate design reforms consistent with those summarized in PG\&E's Electric Rate Design Reform Proposal filed in this proceeding on May 29, 2013 and further discussed in PG\&E's comments on rate design proposals on July 12 and 26, 2013. Specifically, PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal will:

- Narrow the differential between the highest and lowest tier rates for non-California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) customers to better align rates with cost of service, and provide a measure of bill relief for upper-tier consuming households throughout PG\&E's service area who have, since the energy crisis, borne the burden of paying rates well in excess of average rates.
- For CARE rate schedules, increase rates in all three tiers to begin the transition that will ultimately reduce the discount to CARE customers to between 30 and 35 percent as required by AB 327 , with the transition continuing in future years until the CARE discount reaches the legislatively mandated level.
- Seek approval to update electric baseline quantities with the most recent four years of usage data, consistent with the Commission's Rate Case Plan. ${ }^{3}$

Table 1-1 shows how rates for PG\&E's standard non-CARE rate tariff (Schedule E-1) would change under PG\&E's proposal in this proceeding. 4 Per the Commission's guidelines, PG\&E's proposal retains the current four-tier rate structure. However, by modestly increasing the Tier 1 and 2 rates while decreasing the Tier 3 and 4 rates, PG\&E's proposal takes a first step toward narrowing the very large rate differentials that currently exist between Tier 1 and 2 rates on the one hand, and Tier 3 and 4 rates on the other. As Table 1-1 shows, PG\&E's proposal would increase Tier 1 and 2 rates by about 1.1 and 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour ( kWh ), respectively, while decreasing Tier 3 and 4 rates by about 2.8 and 0.8 cents per kWh , respectively. The effect is to make a small reduction to the rate differential between the bottom and top tier rates, from about 21.7 cents to about 19.9 cents per kWh. 5

Under the CPUC's Rate Case Plan as well as its decision in Decision 02-04-026 in the Baseline OIR, it has long been CPUC practice that the most recent four years of historical usage data by climate zone, used to set baseline quantities, be included as part of the utilities' showings in General Rate Case (GRC) Phase II proceedings. However, PG\&E's proposal to do so in its 2014 GRC Phase II proceeding was suspended in that proceeding to avoid overlap with this proceeding. Also, in its 2012 Rate Design Window (RDW) proceeding, Application 12-02-020, PG\&E proposed to reduce baseline quantities from 55 to 50 percent of historical average usage. This proposal has been fully litigated and a proposed decision is pending. Regardless of the Commission's ultimate decision on the percentage to use (i.e., 50 percent as proposed by PG\&E, 55 percent, or some percentage in between), the Commission in this proceeding should adopt updated and more current historical average usage figures to which the percentage adopted in the 2012 RDW proceeding should apply. Such updates of historical usage data have not been controversial in previous rate design proceedings.

4 As described in more detail in Chapter 2, Section B, the proposed rates assume approval of all pending PG\&E revenue requirement increases. Both Table 1-1 and 1-2 also show "SB 695-Adjusted Present Rates." As described in Chapter 2, the SB 695adjusted rates are simply the levels at which present rates would be had PG\&E had sufficient time to implement, on January 1, 2014, the Advice Letter 4314-E rate changes approved by the Commission on December 31, 2013.
5 PG\&E's proposal narrows the difference between the Tier 2 and 3 rates even more, reducing it from 15.9 to 11.6 cents per kWh .

TABLE 1-1
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PRESENT AND PROPOSED NON-CARE (SCHEDULE E-1) RATES

| A | B | C | D | E |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tier | SB 695-Adjusted <br> Present Rates <br> $(\$ / \mathrm{kWh})$ | PG\&E's Proposed <br> Rates $(\$ / \mathrm{kWh})$ | Rate Change <br> $(\$ / \mathrm{kWh})$ |
| Usage Level | 1 | $\$ 0.13627$ | $\$ 0.14707$ | $\$ 0.01080$ |
| Zero to $100 \%$ of Baseline | 2 | $\$ 0.15491$ | $\$ 0.17028$ | $\$ 0.01537$ |
| $100 \%$ to $130 \%$ of Baseline | 3 | $\$ 0.31353$ | $\$ 0.28603$ | $-\$ 0.02750$ |
| $130 \%$ to $200 \%$ of Baseline | 4 | $\$ 0.35353$ | $\$ 0.34603$ | $-\$ 0.00750$ |
| Over 200\% of Baseline | 4 |  |  |  |

Table 1-2 similarly shows how rates for PG\&E's standard CARE rates (Schedule EL-1) would change under PG\&E's proposal. PG\&E is proposing modest rate increases here to begin the process of reducing the CARE discount percentage towards the mandated 30 to 35 percent range. Specifically, PG\&E is proposing to increase CARE rates in Tiers 1,2 and 3 by about $0.5,0.6$ and 0.8 cents per kWh, respectively. As described in Chapter 2, Section D, these modest increases yield acceptable bill increases for CARE households and still leave PG\&E's CARE rates well below the levels of the other two California utilities.

TABLE 1-2
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PRESENT AND PROPOSED CARE (SCHEDULE EL-1) RATES

| A | B | C | D | E |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Usage Level | Tier | SB 695-Adjusted <br> Present Rates <br> $(\$ / k W h)$ | PG\&E's Proposed <br> Rates $(\$ / k W h)$ | Rate Change <br> $(\$ / k W h)$ |
| Zero to $100 \%$ of Baseline | 1 | $\$ 0.08565$ | $\$ 0.09072$ | $\$ 0.00507$ |
| $100 \%$ to $130 \%$ of Baseline | 2 | $\$ 0.09850$ | $\$ 0.10433$ | $\$ 0.00583$ |
| Over 130\% of Baseline | 3 | $\$ 0.13974$ | $\$ 0.14802$ | $\$ 0.00828$ |

PG\&E's 2014 summer rate reform proposal is critically needed and should be expeditiously approved in time for summer 2014 in order to begin to mitigate the very high summer bills of hundreds of thousands of upper-tier consuming PG\&E customers. If this rate reform is not adopted and the current inequitably imbalanced rate design is retained, non-CARE residential upper tier bill
increases would be exacerbated by perpetuating a rate design that is far from actual cost of service, during a time when PG\&E is committed to the implementation of California's ambitious energy and environmental policy goals and requirements.

PG\&E will undertake appropriate customer education and outreach to customers to help minimize confusion and inform customers of the interim summer 2014 rate changes adopted by the Commission. The proposed changes to the CARE discount are modest, and PG\&E will soon, in Phase 1 of this proceeding, be proposing to continue to adjust these discounts over a reasonable transition period to reach the 30 to 35 percent range mandated by AB 327.

PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal is just one important step in the multi-step process of reform that is needed to fix PG\&E's broken electric rate design structure to be consistent with AB 327 and comply with the Principles of Optimal Residential Rate Design adopted in this proceeding. PG\&E expects to file a "long term" rate reform proposal at the end of February in Phase 1 of this proceeding. In that filing, PG\&E will propose additional steps to progressively move rates closer to cost of service over the next several years, with CARE discounts dropping further toward the legislatively mandated range of 30 to 35 percent.

Over a reasonable transition period, the cumulative effect of PG\&E's expected overall rate design reform proposals will be to provide many upper-tier consuming residential electric customers in California with relief from volatile electric bills, and also provide better price signals for all customers. Such proposals will make PG\&E's residential rates simpler and more equitable, by flattening the current steep tier differentials that cause too many PG\&E customers to pay rates far above their actual cost of service.

## C. PG\&E's Current Residential Rates Are Highly Inequitable

As discussed above, without PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal, the current broken residential electric rate structure will continue to punish upper-tier consuming households by charging rates well in excess of actual costs. Currently, PG\&E's average residential rate is 17.5 cents per kWh , yet electricity consumed by non-CARE customers in Tier 4 is charged a rate more than double that level, at 36.4 cents per kWh. At the same time, non-CARE
customers consuming in Tiers 1 and 2 pay just 13.2 and 15.0 cents per kWh , respectively. ${ }^{6}$ These order of magnitude differences between the highest and lowest tiers are highly inequitable, and do not in any way comport with the longstanding principle that rate design should reflect cost of service. 7 Maintaining the current broken rate structure would continue to send inaccurate price signals to customers, particularly those non-CARE customers consuming in the lower tiers, as well as CARE customers whose rates are lower today than they were 21 years ago (despite inflation and increases in the cost of providing electric service).

Figure 1-1 graphically illustrates the broken state of present rates. As shown, there is currently a huge 23.1 cent per kWh gap between the lowest and highest tier non-CARE rates. Prior to the energy crisis, PG\&E's non-CARE and CARE rates each had just two tiers, with the upper-tier rate having only a modest price differential compared to the lower-tier rates. In January 2001, the ratio of the highest to the lowest non-CARE rate was just 1.15:1 and the CARE discounts were set at a modest 15.3 percent. Today, after years of legislative restrictions on raising CARE rates and lower-tier non-CARE rates, the ratio of the highest to the lowest non-CARE rate has grown to a whopping 2.75:1, and the average CARE discount is now 48.9 percent. ${ }^{8}$

6 CARE customers consuming in Tier 1 and 2 pay far less. Currently Tier 1 and 2 consuming CARE customers pay 8.3 and 9.6 cents per kWh , respectively, and will pay 8.6 and 9.9 cents per kWh, respectively, once the Senate Bill (SB) 695 adjustment to rates occurs.

7 The lack of cost basis is easily seen by examining how residential rates are designed. Tier 1 and 2 rates for both non-CARE and CARE customers have in recent years been set exogenously under the formulas adopted in SB 695. The CARE Tier 3 rate was similarly set exogenously by the Commission in Decision 11-05-047. The non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates are then solved for at whatever levels are required to collect the residual revenue not collected by the exogenously set rates, with Tiers 3 and 4 currently set at 4 cents apart. So these rates are clearly not based upon PG\&E's marginal costs, or any other measure of cost of service.

8 Public Utilities Code (Pub. Util. Code) Section 739(d)(1) mandates that "In establishing these [baseline] rates, the commission shall avoid excessive rate increases for residential customers, and shall establish an appropriate gradual differentiation between the rates for the respective blocks of usage." In 2001, the Commission believed a top-to-bottom tier ratio of 1.15 -to-1 was "an appropriate gradual differentiation." Clearly, today's steeply tiered rates are very far away from this mandate for gradual differentiation. Now that the Commission has the flexibility to do so, it should promptly begin narrowing the tier differentials so that, after an appropriate transition period, the "appropriate gradual differentiation" standard is once again met.

FIGURE 1-1
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY HISTORICAL PG\&E CARE AND NON-CARE RATES 2001-2014


The huge gap between the highest and lowest tier non-CARE rates means that the former are well above the average residential rate while the latter are well below it. Figure $1-1$ shows that there is an 18.9 cent per kWh gap between the current top-tier rate ( 36.4 cents per kWh ) and the average rate paid by all of PG\&E's residential customers, represented by the dotted purple line ( 17.5 cents/kWh). As noted earlier, Tier 4 sales are currently being charged more than twice the average residential rate. ${ }^{9}$ The customers harmed by today's unfair rate structure are not limited to a particular geographic area, such as the Central Valley, but are spread across most of PG\&E's service territory. 10 The majority of these customers are not rich, and they are not eligible for

9 While not quite as severe of a premium, non-CARE Tier 3 sales, too, are charged a rate far in excess of the average rate (a differential of 14.9 cents per kWh, or 1.85 times as much).
10 PG\&E Rate Data Analysis, 2012 Annual Statistics for Residential Customers by City, April, 2013.
low-income discounts. 11 More than half a million customers charged for usage at or above Tier 3 are middle class families with household incomes of less than $\$ 75,000$ per year. 12 Nor are their overpayments trivial. In fact, one-fifth of PG\&E's residential electric customers—about 1 million—now pay an average of over $\$ 500$ per year in excess of the average residential rate. ${ }^{13}$

Today's skewed, severely inclining tiered electric rates, and their inequitable impact on customers throughout PG\&E's service territory are also very challenging for customers to understand. High upper-tier rates create bill volatility. A typical customer with only modest amounts of usage can experience drastically higher bills during the hottest summer months, merely by driving their usage from Tier 2 up into the sharply higher-priced Tiers 3 and 4 . This bill volatility tends to lead to customer frustration, confusion and dissatisfaction because bill increases are disproportionate compared to the customers' actual changes in usage.

Over the next several years, in keeping with California's energy and environmental policy goals and requirements, PG\&E needs to make significant investments in infrastructure to improve system reliability and safety, as well as to increase its clean energy resources. PG\&E's customers support these utility system investments needed to maintain and improve service. But if the costs are not shared more evenly among all customers, PG\&E and the other California Investor-Owned Utilities (IOU) and policymakers risk a significant consumer backlash against these policies because of their disproportionate rate impacts.

11 Based on a sample of PG\&E's residential customers responding to 2009 Residential Appliance Saturation Survey, PG\&E matched reported income levels to 2012 usage data from PG\&E billing files.
12 Id. Of the 865,000 non-CARE, lower-income households with annual incomes between $\$ 30,000$ and $\$ 60,000$, over one-third have high usage and pay an average annual rate that exceeds the residential class average. Similarly, of the 1 million non-CARE moderate income households in the $\$ 60,000$ to $\$ 100,000$ annual income range, over half have high usage and pay an average annual rate that exceeds the residential class average. In contrast, over 40 percent of the nearly 1.1 million higher income households with incomes exceeding $\$ 100,000$ per year have low usage and pay an annual average rate below the residential class average.
13 PG\&E Rate Data Analysis, 2012 Annual Statistics for Residential Customers by City, April, 2013.

## D. PG\&E's Amended Summer 2014 Rate Reform Proposal Complies With the Commission's Rate Design Principles and Supports the Policies in AB 327

Rate design must balance a number of different objectives that can sometimes come into conflict with one another. PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal and other rate reform proposals are guided by the following rate design principles endorsed by the Commission and provided in $A B 327$.

## 1. Cost of Service

Pub. Util. Code Section 451 requires that the Commission establish rates that are "just and reasonable." Traditionally, "just and reasonable" rates are based on the cost of service. 14 The costs of providing utility services vary with customer usage characteristics and with the facilities needed to serve a customer. Keeping rates as close as possible to cost of service is equitable, in contrast to the current state of residential rates in which post-energy crisis restrictions on changes to rates for Tiers 1 and 2 have caused upper-tier non-CARE rates to bear a disproportionate and highly inequitable share of residential cost of service.

PG\&E's summer rate reform proposal to narrow the difference between top and bottom tier rates helps the process of transitioning below-cost current Tier 1 and 2 rates, and above-cost current Tier 3 and 4 rates, closer to cost of service. Similarly, PG\&E's proposal to begin transitioning CARE rates to the statutory range of between 30 and 35 percent will move these rates somewhat closer to cost of service, while still maintaining a substantial discount for these lower income customers.

## 2. Rate Stability and Reduction in Bill Volatility

As both AB 327 and the Commission's rate design principles note, while it is important to move toward more appropriate, economically efficient and cost-based price signals, this goal should be balanced with a concern for mitigating sudden and unduly large bill increases. This means that the full extent of "cost-based rates" cannot be implemented in one step. PG\&E's summer rate reform proposal is part of a multi-step transition, under which

[^1]reforms to the residential rate structure are implemented over time, balancing the need to move as quickly as possible to fix the current inequitable rate imbalances with a desire to mitigate the bill impacts that would occur if all the necessary reforms were implemented all at once. Moreover, by mitigating increases to the top tier rates that would occur under the current rate design construct (where revenue requirement increases are borne disproportionately by top tier consuming households), PG\&E's summer rate reform proposal will modestly reduce the bill volatility that can occur during summer months in hot areas, and which in 2009 led to the Central Valley "rate revolt." While providing bill reductions and reducing month-to-month bill volatility for upper-tier consuming non-CARE households, PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate proposal also results in reasonable bill increases for non-CARE households consuming in the lower tiers.

## 3. Understandable, Meaningful and Practical to Implement

Along with economically efficient, cost-based pricing, rates should be simple and understandable, to better empower customers to take actions to control their energy expenses and usage. Accordingly, rates should be as simple as possible while retaining appropriate price signals and offering meaningful choices to customers. Furthermore, rates should be practical to implement. Because the CPUC has now limited the scope of proposals allowed in Phase 2 of this OIR, and ordered the utilities to retain the current four-tiered rate structure for summer 2014, PG\&E is no longer proposing to reduce the number of tiers in Phase 2 of this proceeding as it had originally proposed. Instead, PG\&E will more fully address the principle of "simple and understandable" rates as part of its upcoming OIR Phase 1 showing. As with its original November 22, 2013 proposal, PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal has been designed to allow practical implementation in a short time (requiring relatively minor changes to PG\&E's billing system), as is necessary given the urgent need for interim action by summer 2014.

## E. PG\&E's Amended Summer 2014 Rate Reform Proposal Protects CARE Customers

AB 327 requires that discounted rates to low-income CARE customers be transitioned to the range of 30 to 35 percent. PG\&E's current average CARE discount is 48.9 percent and, absent rate reform, will increase to 50.3 percent by summer 2014 (i.e., even further away from the 30 to 35 percent range mandated by statute). 15 PG\&E's overall rate reform proposal must transition CARE discounts downward significantly to reach the 30 to 35 percent range mandated by the new statutory language. To do this, and at the same time ensure that CARE customers are protected against excessive bill impacts, PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal takes an important first step to gradually begin increasing CARE rates.

PG\&E's proposal takes into consideration that CARE customers will necessarily see some bill increases as a result of this proposal, and balances the objective of making progress toward the legislatively mandated minimum CARE discount levels with CARE customers' ability to manage their energy bills and usage. PG\&E's amended proposed rates result in modest bill impacts for CARE households. 16

In addition, PG\&E is implementing CARE program and eligibility reforms that were agreed to by the utilities and consumer groups and enacted by $A B 327$, including updating income guidelines to reflect the change in eligibility for one-person households to two-person household income levels and providing guidance on categorical income eligibility verification requirements. Furthermore, PG\&E is working to improve the targeting and delivery of CARE assistance to eligible customers, and will work in consultation with consumer advocacy groups to develop and propose program changes in the Commission's triennial low income programs proceeding based on the findings presented in

15 The 50.3 percent CARE discount figure is calculated by designing rates under the current rate design construct-where the burden of revenue requirement increases is borne exclusively by upper-tier non-CARE sales-and assuming all pending PG\&E revenue requirement increases are approved by the Commission. (See Chapter 2, Section B , for additional details.)
16 Under PG\&E's amended rate proposal, 80 percent of CARE customers would see average monthly bill increases of less than $\$ 5$, and another 17 percent would see increases between $\$ 5$ and $\$ 10$. Only 3 percent of CARE customers-those consuming large amounts of electricity-would see increases greater than $\$ 10$.
the 2013 Needs Assessment study for the Energy Savings Assistance and CARE programs. With this balanced approach, both PG\&E's overall and its summer 2014 rate reform proposals will ensure that energy assistance levels for CARE customers among California's electric utilities are more consistent and closer to the historical discount levels endorsed by consumer advocates and the utilities during non-energy crisis periods.

## F. PG\&E's Amended Summer 2014 Rate Reform Proposal Should Be Approved Promptly

As demonstrated in PG\&E's testimony and its comments and filings in the Commission's Rate Design rulemaking, California's current IOU residential electric rate design structure is neither cost-based nor equitable, and therefore fails to meet the Commission's rate design principles. ${ }^{17}$ About a million PG\&E residential electric customers across all income levels and all parts of PG\&E's service territory are paying millions of dollars a year in higher electric bills because of the broken rate design structure.

The broken rate structure cannot be fixed in a single step. But it must be fixed soon and through a series of meaningful steps, starting with timely approval of PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal. Without significant and prompt residential electric rate reform, the current unfair shifting of costs among customers will get worse and potentially derail California's ambitious energy and environmental agenda. The Legislature has enacted, and the Governor has approved, $A B 327$, giving the Commission the tools to fix and reform today's broken rate structure. The Commission should expeditiously approve the rate reforms needed to fully implement AB 327, starting with PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal. PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal is a reasonable, modest first step in the transition to a more fair and equitable residential rate design that better aligns with cost of service and principles of equity.

As discussed in PG\&E's testimony and in its earlier rate proposal and comments in this rulemaking, PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal is fully supported by the facts and demographics of PG\&E's customers and costs of

[^2]service, and is consistent with the Commission's principles for optimal rate design and the requirements of $A B 327$. The Commission should adopt PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal in a timely fashion so that PG\&E can begin to provide impacted customers with the significant rate relief they need starting in summer 2014.
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AMENDED SUMMER 2014 RESIDENTIAL RATE DESIGN

## A. Introduction

Over the last 13 years since the California energy crisis, largely due to statutory restrictions which thereafter limited the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC or Commission) rate-setting flexibility, rates for Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG\&E) upper-tier consuming households who are not in the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) program (non-CARE customers) have grown to extremely high levels, far above cost of service. At the same time, rates for lower-tier consuming non-CARE households have remained well below average cost. ${ }^{1}$ In addition, post-energy crisis, the average discount received by PG\&E's CARE households has grown from a modest 15 percent in early 2001 , to an effective discount of 48.9 percent today. ${ }^{2}$ Thus, PG\&E's current residential rates are substantially misaligned from the cost of providing service. As described in Chapter 1, effective January 1, 2014 Assembly Bill (AB) 327 has removed many of the restrictions on the Commission

[^3]that led to today's broken residential rates. With the restoration of its previous discretionary ratemaking authority, the Commission is now able, over a reasonable period of time, to restore residential rates-both their structures and the levels of specific rate components-to more equitable levels that more closely reflect cost of service.

This chapter presents PG\&E's amended proposal for changes in its residential rate design to take effect during summer 2014 (PG\&E's summer season runs from May 1 through October 31). This amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal is a modest but important first step toward providing rate relief for PG\&E's upper-tier consuming non-CARE customers, while also beginning the process of ultimately reducing CARE discounts to the 30 to 35 percent range mandated by AB 327. As a next step, on February 28, 2014, PG\&E expects to make an "OIR Phase 1 " filing in this proceeding, in which it will propose additional rate reforms for 2015 and beyond. ${ }^{3}$ In this "OIR Phase 2 " filing, PG\&E limits its proposal to rates that would become effective in summer 2014, to put residential rates on the path to rate reform as described in PG\&E's May 29, 2013 Electric Rate Design Reform Proposal. ${ }^{4}$ Specifically, PG\&E proposes the following changes to residential rates for summer 2014:

- For all non-CARE rate schedules, begin to make progress toward narrowing the extremely large differential between the bottom and top tier rates, through increases to the bottom-tier rates that allow modest reductions to top-tier rates that today are far above cost.
- For CARE rate schedules, increase rates in all three tiers to begin to reduce the overall CARE discount percentage toward the 30 to 35 percent range mandated in AB 327.
- If the revenue requirement increase between now and summer 2014 turns out to be lower than PG\&E's estimate based upon assumed approval of all pending revenue requirement changes at requested levels, allocate the

[^4]reduced revenue only to non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates (while holding all other rates fixed at the levels proposed herein), to further narrow the differentials between upper- and lower-tier rate levels.

- Update electric baseline quantities to reflect a more recent period of historical electricity usage, as required under the CPUC's Rate Case Plan. ${ }^{5}$ This is described in Appendix A.

The details of how PG\&E's proposed rates were designed, as well as the specific proposed rate values, are presented below in Section B.

PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal complies with the new guidelines provided by the January 24, 2014 Amended Scoping Memo issued by the Assigned Commissioner and ALJ, providing that the utilities in this initial "Phase 2" proceeding for summer 2014 rates propose modest rate changes that do not alter the current four-tier structure. 6

The remainder of this chapter is organized as follows:

- Section B describes PG\&E's proposed summer 2014 rate design and presents a summary table showing proposed changes to rates.
- Section C presents PG\&E's proposals for standard tiered rates for non-CARE customers.
- Section D presents the analogous proposals for standard tiered rates for CARE customers.
- Section E presents PG\&E's proposals for optional Time-of-Use (TOU) (Schedules E-6, E-7 and E-9) and seasonal rates (Schedule E-8).

[^5]- Section F presents PG\&E's proposal for changing residential rates between cases in which the Commission authorizes changes to residential rate design structures.


## B. Summer 2014 Rate Design

In developing its summer 2014 rate reform proposals, PG\&E used as the starting point its current rates (effective January 1, 2014) adjusted for the recently-approved Advice Letter 4314-E, which results in three percent increases to Tier 1 and 2 rates for both non-CARE and CARE customers. ${ }^{7}$ Using these adjusted current rates, PG\&E then followed the guidance provided in the January 24, 2014 Amended Scoping Memo by limiting its proposed increases to Tiers 1 and 2 to:
increases in the lower tiers commensurate with projected increases in the overall revenue requirement allocated to the residential class, plus no more than a few percentage points, if necessary, to keep the upper tiers within a range that will avoid the potential for significant bill volatility and rate shock in the summer. 8

Accordingly, to design proposed rates for summer 2014, PG\&E undertook the following steps:

1. PG\&E estimated the projected revenue requirement increase between January and May 2014, based upon its full requests for revenue requirement changes now pending at the CPUC and at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). These include PG\&E's 2014 GRC Phase I request and a number of other smaller requests, offset by an anticipated $\$ 300$ million PowerEx settlement refund. If all of these requested revenue requirement changes were adopted as proposed, by summer 2014, the combined effect would result in an increase to the residential customer class revenue requirement between now and summer 2014 of an estimated 5.9 percent. 9

[^6]2. PG\&E then designed rates under two different sets of rate design constructs for allocating revenue requirement changes to the various tiered rates "current" and "proposed" - each of which produces rates that collect the identical residential revenue requirement (i.e., 5.9 percent higher). Both sets of summer 2014 rates assume that, between January and May 2014, the Commission approves PG\&E's pending proposal in its 2012 Rate Design Window (RDW) proceeding to reduce baseline quantities from 55 to 50 percent of historical average usage to help mitigate the high upper-tier rate problem. ${ }^{10}$ This proposal has been fully litigated and is awaiting a Commission decision. 11 If adopted in full, this proposal would, by itself, help reduce PG\&E's very high upper-tier non-CARE rates, decreasing them by about 3 cents per kilowatt-hour (kWh). ${ }^{12}$
a. Status Quo Starting Point (Illustrative): To provide a frame of reference showing the rate levels that would occur if all of PG\&E's pending revenue requirement increases (offset by pending decreases) are approved, but the Commission does not approve PG\&E's rate reform proposal, PG\&E first designed hypothetical summer 2014 rates assuming the "current" construct for allocating revenue increases to the various tiers remain in place unchanged. Under the current broken rate construct, the entire 5.9 percent increase in revenue requirement would be borne solely by upper-tier consuming non-CARE customers, since only non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates would increase (while all other tiered rates remain constant). This, of course, would exacerbate the high-tier rate problem by forcing less than one-quarter of the residential sales to

10 A.12-02-020.
11 A complicating factor is that, since PG\&E's 2012 RDW was filed almost two years ago, in February 2012 PG\&E filed its 2014 GRC Phase II application, updating its 50 percent baseline quantities to reflect more recent historical usage data. Whereas the baseline quantities proposed in the 2012 RDW for basic vs. all-electric service in PG\&E's ten climate zones were based on historical usage during the period from November 2005 to October 2009, the 2014 GRC Phase II proposal used baseline quantities reflecting more recent usage-from May 2008 to April 2012. Those proposed updated baseline quantities, using more recent historical usage data, are now part of PG\&E's proposal in this proceeding. See Appendix A.
12 PG\&E's proposed summer 2014 rates set forth herein already include this reduction, as they assume adoption of the pending 50 percent baseline proposal. See discussion at page 2-7.
bear the entire increase. This is not PG\&E's proposal, but rather is provided merely to illustrate the levels to which upper tier rates will rise, if no reform were begun this summer and the current construct for designing rates were retained.
b. PG\&E's Amended Summer Rate Design Proposal: PG\&E then designed its amended proposed summer 2014 rates, using the new rate design construct it is proposing in this proceeding. PG\&E's proposed new rate design construct results in increased lower-tier non-CARE rates and increased CARE rates in all tiers, so that (a) non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates can begin to drop from their current inequitably high levels, and (b) the CARE discount can begin to be decreased from its current high level toward the 30 to 35 percent range mandated by $A B 327.13$ Specifically, PG\&E proposes the following guidelines for rate changes based on the CPUC's directive at the Prehearing Conference:

- Increase all three CARE tiered rates by the projected 5.9 percent increase in the overall residential revenue requirement.
- Increase the non-CARE Tier 1 rate by the same projected 5.9 percent increase plus an additional 2.0 percent, for a 7.9 percent total increase.
- Increase the non-CARE Tier 2 rate by the same 5.9 percent increase plus an additional 4.0 percent, for a 9.9 percent total increase.
- Set non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates at the levels necessary to collect the remaining revenue requirement in such a way that the difference between the two rates is 6 cents per kWh. 14

13 PG\&E's CARE discount percentage at current rates is 48.9 percent. After adjusting rates for the CPUC-approved Senate Bill (SB) 695 rate changes, it decreases slightly to 48.0 percent, still far from AB 327 's mandated range of 30 to 35 percent.

14 Currently, non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates are 4 cents per kWh apart. PG\&E expects that it will soon be proposing (in Phase 1 of this proceeding) to collapse Tiers 2 and 3 into a single tier beginning in 2015. In anticipation of this, and to make the transition easier, one of PG\&E's objectives for summer 2014 is to reduce the current 17.3 cent differential between those two rates. PG\&E's proposal here for a fixed 6 cent per kWh differential between Tier 3 and 4 (instead of the current 4 cent differential) will have the effect of decreasing the Tier 3 rate. In concert with an increasing Tier 2 rate, the Tier 2 vs. Tier 3 rate differential will narrow.

Since the rates designed using the "current" and "proposed" rate design constructs both produce the same revenue, a comparison of the rates and bill impacts between the two effectively isolates the effect of the rate design proposals independent of revenue requirement changes. 15

As described earlier, PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal is designed in part to balance the objectives of increasing CARE rates in order to reduce the CARE discount percentage toward the legislatively mandated range, while managing customer bill impacts for CARE households. PG\&E believes its amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal strikes a reasonable balance, assuming that PG\&E's baseline quantities are set at 50 percent of historical average usage per PG\&E's pending 2012 RDW proposal. If, however, the Commission were to adopt something different from PG\&E's proposal for 50 percent baseline quantities by May 1, 2014, and either were to leave PG\&E's baseline quantities at their current 55 percent level or were to adopt a level in between 50 and 55 percent, proposed CARE rates could be set at higher levels and still result in similar levels of bill impacts as PG\&E is proposing here. In the event of that outcome, PG\&E alternatively would propose in this showing to adjust its proposed CARE rates upward so as to result in the same approximate average CARE rate as would occur if PG\&E's 50 percent baseline proposal were approved. The rates for this illustrative " 55 percent baseline contingency calculation" are shown below in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 shows present (January 1, 2014) rates, SB 695-adjusted rates (i.e., including the recently approved three percent increases to Tier 1 and 2 rates for both non-CARE and CARE customers), and proposed summer 2014 rates for non-CARE and CARE customers taking service on PG\&E's standard tiered rate schedules, Schedules E-1 and EL-1. Column C shows PG\&E's present rates, effective January 1, 2014. Column D shows those rates adjusted for the 3 percent SB 695 increases to non-CARE and CARE Tier 1 and 2 rates. The non-CARE and CARE Tier 1 and 2 rates are three percent higher, while the non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates each decrease by about 1.0 cents per kWh.

[^7]Columns E through G show what summer 2014 rates would be assuming approval of all pending revenue requirement increases. Column E shows the rates assuming the current rate design construct is used. Absent rate reform, lower-tier non-CARE rates and all CARE rates would remain unchanged, and non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates would increase by about 0.5 cents per kWhwhich would result in a top-tier rate of about 35.9 cents per kWh. 16

Column F shows PG\&E's amended proposed summer 2014 rates, based upon the proposed new rate design construct described earlier in this section. Under PG\&E's amended summer 2014 proposal, non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates decrease by about 2.8 and 0.8 cents, respectively, a small first step toward reducing the huge rate differential that currently exists between lower-tier and upper-tier residential rates. In addition, under PG\&E's proposal, CARE rates begin to increase, a necessary step to begin to reduce the CARE discount to the mandated 30 to 35 percent range. Under PG\&E's proposal, PG\&E's CARE discount percentage decreases slightly from its current level of 48.9 percent to 47.4 percent. 17

Finally, Column G shows PG\&E's aforementioned illustrative "contingency" rate calculation for summer 2014 in the event the Commission does not approve PG\&E's 2012 RDW proposal to reduce baseline quantities to 50 percent of historical average usage. 18 Columns $F$ and $G$ therefore provide "book-end" proposed rate levels to account for the uncertainty regarding the levels at which future baseline quantities are set.

16 These rates assume PG\&E's 2012 RDW proposal to reduce baseline quantities to 50 percent of historical usage is approved in full. The increases to non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates would, of course, be significantly higher (approximately 3 cents per kWh) if the Commission did not approve PG\&E's 2012 RDW proposal.

17 This reduction is due to the combination of the SB 695 adjustment (that has been approved by the Commission but is not yet in rates) and PG\&E's amended rate proposal. As noted earlier, at current revenue levels, the effect of the early 2014 SB 695 adjustment to rates is to reduce the CARE discount from 48.9 to 48.0 percent. At summer 2014 revenue levels (assuming all pending requests are approved), absent rate reform the CARE discount would increase to 50.3 percent. PG\&E's amended rate proposal here would bring it back down to 47.4 percent.
18 The contingency rates were calculated by increasing CARE rates by the 5.9 percent increase in the residential class revenue requirement plus a 2.0 percent adder, for a 7.9 percent total increase. This results in slightly higher CARE rates (by about 0.2 cents per kWh).

TABLE 2-1
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
NON-CARE (SCHEDULE E-1) AND CARE (SCHEDULE EL-1) RATES PRESENT JANUARY 2014 AND PROPOSED SUMMER 2014

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Present Rates |  | Summer 2014 Rates |  |  |
| Usage Level | Tier | January 2014 <br> Rates ${ }^{1}$ | SB 695-Adjusted Rates $^{1}$ | Under Current Rate Design Construct ${ }^{2}$ | PG\&E's Rate Proposal ${ }^{2}$ | PG\&E's Contingency <br> Rate Calculation |
| Non-CARE (Schedule E-1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zero to $100 \%$ of Baseline | 1 | \$0.13230 | \$0.13627 | \$0.13627 | \$0.14707 | \$0.14707 |
| 100\% to $130 \%$ of Baseline | 2 | \$0.15040 | \$0.15491 | \$0.15491 | \$0.17028 | \$0.17028 |
| 130\% to 200\% of Baseline | 3 | \$0.32377 | \$0.31353 | \$0.31931 | \$0.28603 | \$0.31269 |
| Over 200\% of Baseline | 4 | \$0.36377 | \$0.35353 | \$0.35931 | \$0.34603 | \$0.37269 |
| CARE (Schedule EL-1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zero to $100 \%$ of Baseline | 1 | \$0.08316 | \$0.08565 | \$0.08565 | \$0.09072 | \$0.09244 |
| $100 \%$ to $130 \%$ of Baseline | 2 | \$0.09563 | \$0.09850 | \$0.09850 | \$0.10433 | \$0.10630 |
| Over 130\% of Baseline | 3 | \$0.13974 | \$0.13974 | \$0.13974 | \$0.14802 | \$0.15081 |

Notes:

1. Baseline quantities based on $55 \%$ of historical average usage.
2. Baseline quantities based on $50 \%$ of historical average usage.

To assess the effects of its proposal on customer bills, PG\&E has run the following three sets of bill comparisons:

1) Bills at summer 2014 rates under PG\&E's proposed new rate design construct (Column F in Table 2-1) vs. bills at summer 2014 rates under the current rate design construct (Column E), both at full proposed revenue requirement changes.
2) Bills at summer 2014 rates under PG\&E's proposed new rate design construct (Column F) vs. bills at SB 695-adjusted rates (Column D), the former reflecting full proposed revenue requirement changes and the latter reflecting the current revenue requirement.
3) Bills at summer 2014 rates under the current rate design construct (Column E) vs. bills at SB 695-adjusted rates (Column D), the former reflecting full proposed revenue requirement changes and the latter reflecting the current revenue requirement.

Bill Comparison (1) above isolates the effect of the rate design proposal from changes in revenue requirements, as is typically done in GRC Phase II proceedings where the focus is, as here, on the effects of the rate design. PG\&E believes this is the appropriate bill comparison that the Commission
should focus on, since it is a fair, "apples to apples" comparison of two different rate designs which yield the identical revenue. PG\&E understands, though, that there is interest in seeing the combined effect of PG\&E's new rate proposal along with a projected revenue requirement increase. Bill Comparison (2) above provides that information. However, if Bill Comparison (2) is to be given weight by the Commission, then so must Bill Comparison (3), since bill impacts will occur under the "no rate reform" case as well.

Moreover, analyzing the annualized average effects of revenue requirement changes in addition to rate design changes requires consideration of other revenue requirement offsets, such as the bill-lowering effects of the approximately $\$ 60$ per year Climate Dividend that is expected to begin being credited to customers' bills twice a year by summer 2014.19 Per the direction of the ALJ, PG\&E has not included these bill-lowering effects in any of the three bill impact comparisons it has run for this proposal. However, the Climate Dividend produces annual bill savings to every residential customer, and therefore affects and directly impacts every single customer's average monthly bill over the course of the year. So if, under Bill Comparison (2)-which looks only at the effects of changing energy charges-a group of customers appears to see average monthly bill impacts of $\$ 5$, these increases (which total $\$ 60$ on an annual basis) would in reality be exactly offset on an annualized basis by the semi-annual Climate Dividends of $\$ 30$, comparable to any recurring Commission-approved "credit" to customers' bills. In other words, the Climate Dividend impacts overall average bills as directly as a fixed, recurring "customer" charge would, and thus the bill impacts of PG\&E's proposal on a prospective basis must consider those impacts in the same way the impact of a fixed charge would be considered. 20

PG\&E's proposed summer 2014 rates were designed assuming a 5.9 percent increase in residential revenue requirement, based on the assumption that all pending PG\&E revenue requirement increases (and

19 The Climate Dividend will be credited on every residential customer's bills for April and October of each year, as a $\$ 30$ credit on each of those two bills.

20 The effects of the Climate Dividend can be ignored in Bill Comparison (1), since customers will receive the $\$ 60$ per year benefit in their bills under both sets of summer 2014 rates.
decreases) are approved by either the CPUC or the FERC prior to summer 2014. As described in Sections C, D and E, PG\&E's proposed rates result in reasonable levels of bill impacts for those customers impacted by the changes (and also, of course, result in favorable bill impacts for many non-CARE upper-tier consuming households who have long paid more than their cost of service, and would be paying even more in the summer 2014 without action by the CPUC to approve these proposals). Because of this, if the ultimate overall revenue requirement increase to the residential class turns out to be less than 5.9 percent, PG\&E proposes that non-CARE Tier 1 and 2 rates, as well as all CARE rates, remain at the levels shown in Table 2-1, and that non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates be adjusted downward to the degree necessary to account for the lower revenue requirement. These two rates are currently far above cost of service, and this approach would ensure that the situation does not worsen, and help to avoid the high bill and bill volatility problems that have caused great concern for some time now to over a million affected PG\&E customers (which spurred action by the legislature, ${ }^{21}$ as well as by the Commission in initiating this OIR). In addition, by narrowing the differential between lower-tier and upper-tier rates, this approach is consistent with the statutory mandate in Public Utilities Code Section 739(d)(1) for "an appropriate gradual differential" between the rates in successive tiers. Finally, it is consistent with the objective stated in the Energy Division (ED) Staff Report to move towards a target rate differential of no more than 1.20:1. PG\&E's current Tier 4 to Tier 1 ratio is $2.75: 1$, far in excess of the ED's ultimate target ratio of 1.20:1. PG\&E's amended proposed rates shown in Table 2-1 would reduce this ratio to $2.35: 1$, and in the event the revenue requirement increase ultimately turned out to be less than 5.9 percent, this ratio would be lower still under PG\&E's proposed approach. ${ }^{22}$

[^8]
## C. Standard Non-CARE Rates

## 1. Proposed Summer 2014 Non-CARE Rates

A significant driver behind the Legislature's adoption of AB 327 was the recognition that the post-energy crisis four- and five-tier structures and related $A B 1 x$ constraints forced almost all rate increases onto a very small portion (one-quarter or less) of residential sales (i.e., non-CARE sales occurring in Tier 3 and above), causing a large and inequitable disparity between the upper- and lower-tier rates. Non-CARE upper-tier rates skyrocketed and, despite the CPUC's efforts prior to AB 327, the prices paid by over a million PG\&E customers remain at levels that are far above PG\&E's marginal costs or any other measure of cost of service. On the other hand, non-CARE customers whose usage remains in the lower tiers currently pay (and have paid for over a decade) prices well below the cost to serve them.

PG\&E's upper-tier rates are among the highest tiered rates in the state, and PG\&E is concerned about their impacts on customer bills, and serious bill volatility problems, when hot weather returns in summer 2014. PG\&E has researched the standard residential energy rates of 35 other investorowned and publicly-owned utilities in California. ${ }^{23}$ Table 2-2 shows the highest tier rate of each utility, including PG\&E, sorted from lowest to highest (with the three investor-owned utilities' rates shown in bold). ${ }^{24}$ Only two utilities, Hercules Municipal Utility (which is in the process of selling its distribution system to PG\&E) and San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG\&E), charge a higher top-tier energy rate than PG\&E's current Tier 4

23 "Standard rates" here means non-TOU rates.
24 Some utilities have different summer and winter rates in each tier. For these utilities, PG\&E took the simple average of the two seasonal rates.
rate of 36.4 cents per kWh. 25 Indeed, all three of the investor-owned utilities have top-tier rates in the top quartile, in excess of 30 cents per kWh .

25 Similarly, PG\&E's steep tier differential and high upper-tier rates also appear to be an outlier nationally, based on testimony received into evidence in PG\&E's 2012 RDW. During hearings in that proceeding, TURN's witness, Mr. William Marcus, who works on rate design issues for clients in parts of the country other than California, testified that he did not know of any electric utility in the country with a non-TOU rate anywhere near the level of PG\&E's upper tier rate, or its upper and lower tier differential. And Mr. Marcus stated that he knew of only one other utility in the nation other than those in California (Austin Electric in Texas) that had more than three tiers for its residential rate. (See citations in PG\&E's Opening Brief of November 2, 2012, in A.12-02-020 at p. 10.)

TABLE 2-2
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY COMPARISON OF TOP TIER RATE OF CALIFORNIA UTILITIES

|  | Uighest Tier |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Utility | Hasadena <br> Rate $(\$ / k W h)$ |
| 2 | Vernon | $\$ 0.066$ |
| 3 | Imperial Valley | $\$ 0.069$ |
| 4 | Santa Clara | $\$ 0.085$ |
| 5 | Lassen | $\$ 0.107$ |
| 6 | Truckee | $\$ 0.120$ |
| 7 | Turlock | $\$ 0.132$ |
| 8 | Redding | $\$ 0.143$ |
| 9 | Turlock (Westside) | $\$ 0.144$ |
| 10 | Azusa | $\$ 0.153$ |
| 11 | Ukiah | $\$ 0.153$ |
| 12 | Modesto | $\$ 0.153$ |
| 13 | LADWP | $\$ 0.165$ |
| 14 | Shasta Lake | $\$ 0.167$ |
| 15 | Palo Alto | $\$ 0.170$ |
| 16 | Burbank | $\$ 0.174$ |
| 17 | Roseville | $\$ 0.177$ |
| 18 | Sacramento | $\$ 0.178$ |
| 19 | Riverside | $\$ 0.182$ |
| 20 | Glendale | $\$ 0.187$ |
| 21 | Anaheim | $\$ 0.187$ |
| 22 | Alameda | $\$ 0.191$ |
| 23 | Biggs | $\$ 0.194$ |
| 24 | Gridley | $\$ 0.207$ |
| 25 | Lompoc | $\$ 0.261$ |
| 26 | Banning | $\$ 0.275$ |
| 27 | Colton | $\$ 0.288$ |
| 28 | SCE | $\$ 0.292$ |
| 29 | Healdsburg | $\$ 0.304$ |
| 30 | Corona | $\$ 0.318$ |
| 31 | Merced | $\$ 0.323$ |
| 32 | Lodi | $\$ 0.350$ |
| 33 | Island Energy | $\$ 0.350$ |
| 34 | PG\&E | $\$ 0.351$ |
| 35 | SDG\&E | $\$ 0.364$ |
| 36 | Hercules | $\$ 0.369$ |
|  | $\$ 0.499$ |  |

As a result, PG\&E is proposing rate increases for lower-tier non-CARE customers that will make immediate meaningful progress toward addressing the high upper-tier rate problem and the subsidy that upper-tier consuming non-CARE households have been forced to provide to others due to prior legislative restrictions. This inequity should be remedied as soon as possible, now that the Commission has the authority to do so.

Consequently, the first step to doing so should be a significant one. Specifically, as described in Section B and summarized in Table 2-1, PG\&E is proposing the following changes to its non-CARE (Schedule E-1) rates: ${ }^{26}$

- Increasing the non-CARE Tier 1 rate by 7.9 percent. This results in just a 1.1 cent per kWh increase over its SB 695-adjusted level, to 14.7 cents per kWh . The proposed new level is still considerably below PG\&E's anticipated summer 2014 average rate of 17.6 cents per kWh for the residential class, and well below PG\&E's anticipated summer 2014 average rate of 20.1 cents per kWh for non-CARE customers.
- Increasing the non-CARE Tier 2 rate by 9.9 percent. This results in just a 1.5 cent per kWh increase over its SB 695-adjusted level, to 17.0 cents per kWh. This rate, too, is below PG\&E's anticipated summer 2014 residential class and non-CARE only average rates.
- Decreasing the non-CARE Tier 3 rate by 2.8 cents compared to its SB 695-adjusted level, to 28.6 cents per kWh. Even with this reduction, it remains far above the anticipated summer 2014 residential class and non-CARE average rates.
- Decreasing the non-CARE Tier 4 rate by 0.8 cents compared to its SB 695-adjusted level, to 34.6 cents per kWh. Like the non-CARE Tier 3 rate, it remains far above the anticipated summer 2014 residential class and non-CARE average rates. ${ }^{27}$
These proposed interim reductions in the rates paid by upper-tier non-CARE households begin the process of moving them to more reasonable and less punitive levels, and, in combination with the modest increases proposed for CARE rates, will begin to reduce the CARE discount

26 PG\&E is proposing similar changes (i.e., increasing Tier 1 and 2 rates and decreasing Tier 3 and 4 rates, to narrow the rate differentials between top and bottom tiers) for its voluntary rate schedules. These are described in Section E.
27 Under PG\&E's proposal, the lower-tier non-CARE rates, and the CARE rates in all tiers, would remain fixed at the levels shown in Table 2-1 regardless of the ultimate revenue requirement changes between now and summer 2014. Consequently, the non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates will decrease by more than 2.8 and 0.8 cents per kWh, respectively, if the pending revenue requirement approvals are less than requested.
percentage toward the required $A B 327$ range. 28 For example, currently the gap between the bottom and top tier rates is 23.1 cents per kWh . Under PG\&E's proposal, this gap would narrow to 19.9 cents per kWh. Similarly, the gap between the rates for Tiers 2 and 3 (the two tiers which PG\&E anticipates it will be proposing to collapse into a single tier in 2015) is currently 17.3 cents per kWh. Under PG\&E's proposal, this gap would narrow to 11.6 cents per kWh. These changes are a modest, yet appreciable, first step toward narrowing the very large differentials between lower- and upper-tier rates, and reducing the large, inequitable, subsidies that currently exist between upper-tier and lower-tier consuming households.

## 2. Bill Impacts

In order to evaluate the bill impacts specifically resulting from PG\&E's summer 2014 rate reform proposal, in this section (and in Section D. 3 below summarizing bill impacts for CARE customers), PG\&E focuses on Bill Comparison (1) described earlier in Section B. Bill Comparison (1) evaluates customer bills under two different sets of rates that both collect the same revenue requirement-PG\&E's amended proposed summer 2014 rates (shown in Column F of Table 2-1) and the summer 2014 rates that would result under the current rate design construct if there is no rate reform (shown in Column E of the same table). Figure 2-1 below shows the distribution of bill impacts. Detailed results for Bill Comparison (1) are shown in Appendix C-1. 29

In the detailed rate table presented in Appendix B-1, PG\&E shows 2014 summer rates under the current (status quo) rate design construct and under PG\&E's new proposed construct (i.e., its amended proposed rates here) by functionalized rate components, most of which do not change. PG\&E's proposed changes to total rates do, though, cause changes in the Public Purpose Program (PPP), distribution, generation and conservation incentive adjustment rate components. The rate comparisons shown in Appendix B-1 correspond to a comparison between Columns E and F in Table 2-1 (except that all residential rate schedules are shown). Appendices $B-2$ and $B-3$ show similar detailed rate comparisons for all rate schedules between Columns D and F and between Columns D and E, respectively.
29 The detailed results for Bill Comparisons (2) and (3) are presented in Appendices C-2 and C-3, respectively. Shortly after serving this amended testimony, PG\&E will also present its bill impact showing using the Energy Division's very recently finalized table format, to ensure standardized presentment by each of the three utilities' bill impacts, for ease of comparison. PG\&E requests that its additional tables also be made part of the record in this proceeding.

For non-CARE customers taking service on Schedule E-1, the results in Appendix C show that the effect of the rate design changes proposed by PG\&E for summer 2014 result in lower bills for some and higher bills for others. This is the anticipated result, since PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal is designed to provide bill relief for upper-tier consuming households who, for over a decade, have paid rates well above the class average, while beginning to increase the bills of lower-tier consuming households who have paid below-average rates. A total of 38 percent of PG\&E's customers will have lower average monthly bills under PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal. About 1 percent will see no change (or a negligible change). Of the remaining 61 percent, 43 percent will see very small average monthly increases of less than $\$ 3.00$, and another 16 percent will see increases of between $\$ 3.00$ and $\$ 5.12 .30$ So about 98 percent of Schedule E-1 customers will see either decreases in their average monthly bill or increases that average less than about $\$ 5$ per month.

30 Of the remaining 2 percent, 1 percent would see average monthly bill increases between $\$ 5.12$ and $\$ 6.51$, with the other 1 percent seeing higher increases.

FIGURE 2-1
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
BILL COMPARISON (1) - DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE MONTHLY BILL IMPACTS NON-CARE (SCHEDULE E-1) CUSTOMERS

D. Standard CARE Rates

1. Proposed Summer 2014 CARE Rates

PG\&E's CARE Schedule EL-1 comprises 99 percent of all CARE households. Its optional CARE schedules-TOU Schedules EL-6 and EL-7 and seasonal Schedule EL-8-represent the remainder. In this section, PG\&E makes the following specific proposals for Schedule EL-1, which also apply to optional CARE Schedules EL-6, EL-7, and EL-8.

The legislature has determined, in $A B 327$, that the average CARE discount should "be no less than 30 percent and no more than 35 percent of the revenues that would have been produced for the same billed usage by non-CARE customers...." The legislation also states that the utilities "shall not reduce, on an annual basis, the average effective CARE discount by more than a reasonable percentage decrease below the discount in effect on January 1, 2013...."31 Similarly, the Assigned Commissioner's

Ruling (ACR) in this proceeding, issued on October 25, 2013, calling for the expedited filing of these interim rate change proposals, included among its enumerated guidelines that "rates should be adjusted as necessary to prevent CARE rates from increasing beyond the statutory effective CARE discount of 35 percent without reducing the discount more than a reasonable percentage annually."32

The amended summer 2014 CARE rate reform proposal PG\&E presents in this request complies with that guideline and represents an important step in implementing AB 327's intent to ultimately transition the CARE program to significantly lower, yet reasonable, discount levels, as required by the legislature. Specifically, for summer 2014, PG\&E proposes the following changes in CARE rate design for Schedule EL-1: Set the EL-1 Tier 1 rate at 9.1 cents per kWh, the Tier 2 rate at 10.4 cents per kWh and the Tier 3 rate at 14.8 cents per $\mathrm{kWh}{ }^{33}$ This represents an increase of 0.5 cents to Tier 1 , 0.6 cents to Tier 2 and 0.8 cents to Tier 3 when compared to January 2014 rates adjusted for the SB 695 increases. PG\&E proposes that these same cents per kWh increases also be applied to rates in Tiers 1, 2 and 3 for Schedules EL-6, EL-7, and EL-8.

Table 2-3 compares past, current, filed and proposed EL-1 rates, including the effect of the Climate Dividend on the annual average CARE rates in 2014.

32 October 25, 2013, ACR, p. 5.
33 As described in Section B of this chapter, these rates are calculated by increasing each tier's SB 695 -adjusted rate by 5.9 percent, the same percentage increase allocated to the residential class as a whole.

TABLE 2-3
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY COMPARISON OF PAST, PRESENT, FILED AND PROPOSED CARE (EL-1) RATES (\$/KWH)

| Line No. | Tier | 1993 | 2013 | SB 695 Adjusted 2014 | Proposed Summer 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Tier 1 | \$0.101 | \$0.083 | \$0.086 | \$0.091 |
| 2 | Tier 2 | \$0.117 | \$0.096 | \$0.099 | \$0.104 |
| 3 | Tier 3 | \$0.117 | \$0.140 | \$0.140 | \$0.148 |
| 4 | Average Rate(a) | \$0.105 | \$0.099 | \$0.100 | \$0.109 |
| 5 | Climate Dividend per year | N/A | N/A | (\$59.62) | (\$59.62) |
| 6 | Net Annual Average Rate(b) | \$0.105 | \$0.099 | \$0.090 | \$0.100 |
| 7 | Baseline Quantities(c) | 60\% | 55\% | 55\% | 50\% |

(a) The average rates shown for 2014 reflect significantly less usage in Tier 3 compared to 2013. As a result, the average SB 695-adjusted rate is slightly higher than in 2013 despite a 3 percent increase in Tier 1 and Tier 2 rates.
(b) The average rates shown in Line 6 in the last two columns include an adjustment for the value of the Climate Dividend which is expected to begin in 2014.
(c) PG\&E has reflected in its proposed summer 2014 rates the impact of its 2012 RDW (A.12-02-020) proposal to reduce baseline quantities from 55 percent to 50 percent (the statutory minimum).

PG\&E's proposed rates represent relatively modest increases to CARE rates, especially given the context of how little CARE rates have increased in the last two decades.

First, in 1993, the CARE discount in each tier was 15 percent, as was the overall average CARE discount. As PG\&E has described in this testimony, in the ensuing two decades the CARE discount has grown tremendously, with the overall average discount more than tripling to today's 48.9 percent level. Adoption of PG\&E's summer 2014 rate proposal would set the stage for further proposals in Phase 1 of this OIR for necessary reductions that will, over time, move that figure to the 30 to 35 percent range required by law.

Second, PG\&E's proposed CARE Tier 1 and Tier 2 rates are still more than 10 percent below their nominal levels in 1993 when the CARE maximum income qualifying level was considerably lower than it is now (150 percent of the federal poverty level vs. its current level of 200 percent of the federal poverty level).

Third, as discussed above, in 2014, residential customers will begin receiving a Climate Dividend which results in annualized bill reductions of
approximately $\$ 60.34$ Whereas all of the rates in PG\&E's proposal, and the resulting bill impacts, do not reflect the Climate Dividend, the Climate Dividend will have a significant impact on the annual average rates and bills that CARE customers pay in 2014. For example, the Climate Dividend will lower the annual average EL-1 rate from 9.9 cents per kWh in 2013 to 9.0 cents per kWh in 2014 at SB 695-adjusted rates. It would also lower the PG\&E's proposed annual average CARE rate of 10.9 cents per kWh to just 10.0 cents per kWh. As a result, the effective annual average rate paid by CARE customers under PG\&E's proposal in 2014 would still be significantly below the nominal 10.5 cent average rate two decades ago, in 1993.

Although PG\&E's proposal would increase the nominal Tier 1 rate from 8.6 cents to 9.1 cents, the net effective Tier 1 rate paid by CARE customers under this proposal, after deducting the total annual Climate Dividend from total CARE Tier 1 revenues, would drop to an effective annual average of 7.5 cents per kWh, a 12 percent decrease over the present SB 695 adjusted EL-1 Tier 1 rate. As a result, upon implementation of PG\&E's proposal, CARE customers using an average of about 455 kWh 35 per month would still see an annual average bill decrease in 2014, compared to 2013, after accounting for the Climate Dividend. Customers in this group represent more than 40 percent of all CARE customers.

Fourth, PG\&E's summer 2014 rate proposal to reduce the average effective CARE discount would also result in a reduction to the CARE surcharge portion of PPP rate levels by approximately 0.04 cents per kWh for all residential and non-residential customers who pay this rate component.

Finally, PG\&E will undertake appropriate customer education and outreach to CARE customers to minimize confusion and inform CARE customers of these rate changes, consistent with the intent of $A B 327$.

PG\&E's proposed CARE rates represent a 5.9 percent increase in each tier. However, because of the proposed change in baseline quantities, the shift of usage into the significantly higher priced Tier 3 causes the total weighted

34 Based on PG\&E's pending proposal with the CPUC, the annual Climate Dividend in 2014 is anticipated to be about $\$ 60$ per residential customer. (A.13-08-002.)
35 This number varies depending on the climate zone and was calculated as a weighted average.
average increase to be 9.7 percent over PG\&E's SB 695-adjusted CARE rates, scheduled to take effect on March 1, 2014. Without this rate increase, PG\&E's CARE discount would increase beyond its SB 695-adjusted level of 48 percent, in direct contravention of $A B 327$ which orders the utilities to gradually lower their CARE discounts to a maximum of 35 percent.

Table 2-4 below compares PG\&E's present and proposed summer 2014 CARE rates to Southern California Edison Company's (SCE) and SDG\&E's present CARE rates. PG\&E anticipates that SCE and SDG\&E may be proposing increases to their CARE rates, but until PG\&E sees those proposals, it cannot compare its own proposed rates to those proposed by the other two utilities. Nevertheless, it is instructive to compare PG\&E's proposed CARE rate levels to the CARE rates already in place for SCE and SDG\&E. Table 2-4 shows that PG\&E's proposed CARE rates are lower than those of the other two utilities present rates in all but one instance (SCE's Tier 1 rate). Moreover, PG\&E's proposed CARE Tier 3 rate would still be more than 2 cents lower than SDG\&E's present Tier 3 rate and more than 5 cents lower than SCE's present CARE Tier 3 rate. In approving SCE's and SDG\&E's CARE rates currently in effect, the Commission has previously determined that these rate levels are reasonable and affordable for CARE customers in Southern California. There is no reason to believe that PG\&E's proposed CARE rates here-which are comparable or lower than the Commission-approved rates for the other two utilities-would not similarly be reasonable and affordable.

TABLE 2-4
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
COMPARISON OF STANDARD CARE UTILITY RATES TO PG\&E'S PROPOSED RATES

| Line No. | Tier | SCE <br> January 2014 (\$/kWh) | SDG\&E <br> January 2014 (\$/kWh) | PG\&E <br> SB 695 <br> Adjusted 2014 <br> (\$/kWh) | PG\&E <br> Proposed Summer 2014 <br> (\$/kWh)(a) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Tier 1 | \$0.088 | \$0.100 | \$0.086 | \$0.091 |
| 2 | Tier 2 | \$0.110 | \$0.116 | \$0.099 | \$0.104 |
| 3 | Tier 3 | \$0.200 | \$0.170 | \$0.140 | \$0.148 |
| 4 | Basic Service Fee (\$/Month) | \$0.70 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

(a) PG\&E's SB 695-adjusted rates are based on 55 percent baseline quantities. PG\&E's proposed rates for summer 2014 are based on its 50 percent baseline quantities proposal in this proceeding.
2. CARE Rates Remain at a Large Real Discount Compared to Those Charged in 1993

Over the last two decades, CARE rates slipped further and further below the cost of service and the rate of inflation. As Table 2-3 has shown, the present average CARE EL-1 rate of 10.0 cents is, in nominal terms, below the EL-1 average rate of 10.5 cents charged back in 1993. In real terms, it is much lower today than two decades ago. Figure 2-2 shows that if the 10.5-cent-per-kWh average CARE rate in 1993 had simply increased each year with the rate of inflation, it would be 17.3 cents per kWh today. 36 Instead, it is just 10.0 cents per kWh. This represents a 42 percent decrease in the average CARE rate in real terms over the last 21 years. Clearly, electricity has become much more affordable for CARE customers in real terms, due to nominal CARE rates slightly decreasing while other prices in the economy and household incomes rose in nominal terms with inflation. Although PG\&E's summer 2014 proposed CARE rates would increase the average CARE rate from 10.0 cents to 10.9 cents per kWh, this average rate would still remain far below the 17.3 cent nominal level rate in 2014 that is equivalent, in real terms, to the CARE rate level approved by the Commission in 1993. And it would be just 4 percent higher than the 10.5 cent average nominal CARE rate in 1993.37

[^9]FIGURE 2-2
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
AVERAGE CARE (EL-1) RATE VS. CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (CPI)
1993 TO 2014


## 3. The Proposed CARE Rates Would Improve a Weak Conservation Incentive

Since CARE rates have remained largely constant for two decades as prices and incomes grew with inflation, there has been a declining incentive for CARE customers to conserve. PG\&E's CARE Tier 1 and Tier 2 rates are currently set very low. Although both rates will rise on March 1, 2014, the first increase since 1993, this modest 3 percent increase under SB 695 will still leave them about 15 percent below their nominal levels in 1993. In addition, despite the modest increase to CARE Tier 3 rates implemented in January 2013 and the small increases to CARE Tier 1 and Tier 2 rates scheduled for March 1, 2014,38 PG\&E's current CARE Tier 3 rates remain very low and do not provide as strong an incentive for conservation among high usage CARE customers as they should. PG\&E's proposed CARE rate

38 On March 1, 2014, PG\&E expects to implement the last SB 695 adjustment to rates, proposed in Advice Letter 4314-E, and adopted by the CPUC on December 31, 2013.
increases will help incent conservation by ensuring that all CARE rates move closer to PG\&E's average residential rate, and thus better reflect the actual cost to serve these customers.

As Table 2-5 shows below, total discounts received by CARE customers in the 12 months ending August 2013 were $\$ 750$ million. 39 More than three-quarters of the CARE discount, $\$ 580$ million, went to CARE customers with usage in Tier 4 or higher (usage exceeding 200 percent of baseline). As a result of the currently low rates they pay, most CARE customers exceeding 200 percent of baseline still have little incentive to conserve. 40 PG\&E's amended summer 2014 rate reform proposal, with its proposed 5.9 percent increase to all CARE rates, will provide a greater incentive to high-use CARE customers to conserve, and is therefore likely to reduce the overall cost of the CARE program.

TABLE 2-5
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY CARE HOUSEHOLDS AND ELECTRIC DISCOUNTS THROUGH AUGUST 2013(a)

| Line No. | Highest Monthly Tier Reached Over 12 Months | CARE <br> Households | Total CARE Discounts | \% of CARE <br> Households | \% of CARE Discounts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Tier 1 | 220,000 | \$30,000,000 | 18\% | 4\% |
| 2 | Tier 2 | 150,000 | 30,000,000 | 12\% | 4\% |
| 3 | Tier 3 | 340,000 | 110,000,000 | 27\% | 14\% |
| 4 | Tier 4(b) | 320,000 | 200,000,000 | 25\% | 27\% |
| 5 | Tier 5(c) | 140,000 | 160,000,000 | 11\% | 22\% |
| 6 | Tier 6(d) | 80,000 | 220,000,000 | 7\% | 29\% |
| 7 | CARE Total | 1,250,000 | \$750,000,000 | 100\% | 100\% |

(a) 12 months ending August 2013. This data does not reflect the gradual removal of CARE customers exceeding 400 percent of baseline in any given month, per Decision 12-08-044, beginning September 2013.
(b) The Tier 4 group includes customers using between 200 percent and 300 percent of baseline for at least one month.
(c) The Tier 5 group includes customers using between 300 percent and 400 percent of baseline for at least one month.
(d) The Tier 6 group includes customers with usage exceeding 400 percent of baseline for at least one month.

39 The CARE discount is calculated by multiplying CARE sales in each tier times the difference in $\mathrm{E}-1$ rates vs. $\mathrm{EL}-1$ rates for that tier, then summing the resulting dollar amounts over the tiers.

40 The present CARE Tier 3 rate of 14.0 cents per kWh is still 20 percent below the average residential rate of 17.5 cents per kWh.

Table 2-6 shows the explosive growth in CARE participation and total electric discounts since 2000. The number of households has increased more than 4 times while the total discounts today are 25 times their level in 2000.

TABLE 2-6
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY CARE PARTICIPANTS AND DISCOUNTS SINCE 2000

| Line No. | Year | CARE <br> Households | Total CARE Discounts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2000 | 280,000 | \$30,000,000 |
| 2 | 2001 | 400,000 | \$80,000,000 |
| 3 | 2002 | 560,000 | \$130,000,000 |
| 4 | 2003 | 650,000 | \$150,000,000 |
| 5 | 2004 | 730,000 | \$190,000,000 |
| 6 | 2005 | 800,000 | \$220,000,000 |
| 7 | 2006 | 940,000 | \$380,000,000 |
| 8 | 2007 | 970,000 | \$390,000,000 |
| 9 | 2008 | 950,000 | \$390,000,000 |
| 10 | 2009 | 1,020,000 | \$520,000,000 |
| 11 | 2010 | 1,230,000 | \$720,000,000 |
| 12 | 2011 | 1,300,000 | \$790,000,000 |
| 13 | 2012 | 1,280,000 | \$740,000,000 |
| 14 | 2013(a) | 1,250,000 | \$750,000,000 |

(a) 12 months ending August 2013. The year-end total in December will be lower as customers exceeding 400 percent of baseline in any given month are gradually removed from the program, beginning in September.

Finally, as Figure 2-3 shows below, CARE average usage increased at a significantly faster rate than non-CARE usage from 2001 to 2010, on a climate zone-adjusted basis. 41 Where the average non-CARE usage had exceeded the average CARE usage by 110 kWh per month in 2001, that gap has been cut by 40 percent, even after removing from the calculation all CARE customers who exceeded 400 percent of baseline in a single month.

41 In total, CARE customers actually use considerably more than non-CARE customers on a per-household basis, but this is because of the significantly higher percentage of Central Valley customers who are low income. Therefore, PG\&E climate-adjusts the data by assigning weights to CARE usage for each climate zone based on its percent of the total population, not the CARE population.

FIGURE 2-3
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
CLIMATE ADJUSTED AVERAGE MONTHLY USAGE, NON-CARE VS. CARE(a) 2001 TO 2012

(a) Excludes CARE customers exceeding 400 percent of baseline for at least one month per year.
4. Bill Impacts

While all CARE customers see bill increases under PG\&E's proposal, the average monthly impacts from Bill Comparison (1) are modest for most CARE customers. 42 Overall, 81 percent of CARE customers would see bill increases of $\$ 5$ or less. The majority of customers in this group would see bill increases under $\$ 2.50$. In contrast, only 3 percent of CARE customers (those with high electricity consumption levels) would see bill increases greater than $\$ 10$. Figure 2-4 summarizes the bill impacts below.

42 Bill impacts exclude the impact of the climate dividend.

FIGURE 2-4
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
BILL COMPARISON (1) - DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE MONTHLY BILL IMPACTS CARE (SCHEDULE EL-1) CUSTOMERS


The detailed bill comparison tables underlying this summary are in Appendix C-1.

## E. Optional Schedules Rate Design

PG\&E also proposes to adjust the tiered rates for each voluntary schedule (TOU Schedules E-6, EL-6, E-7, EL-7 and E-9, as well as the seasonal rate Schedule E-8 and EL-8) in a similar manner as proposed for standard tiered rates. This is accomplished by changing the TOU and seasonal rates for each tier by the same cents per kWh change proposed for $\mathrm{E}-1$ (non-CARE schedules) and EL-1 (CARE schedules). For example, PG\&E is proposing a 1.1 cent increase in the $\mathrm{E}-1$ Tier 1 rate for summer 2014. This same 1.1 cent per kWh increase is proposed for the Tier 1 rates on Schedule E-6 for every TOU period. Similarly, PG\&E is proposing a 0.5 cent increase in the EL-1 Tier 1 rate for summer 2014. The same 0.5 cent per kWh increase is proposed for the Tier 1 rates on Schedule EL-6 for every TOU period. Similar adjustments are to be made to the other tier rates consistent with the changes proposed for

Schedule E-1 and EL-1.43 See Appendix B-1 for summaries of the January 2014 versus summer 2014 proposed rates.

## F. Rate Changes Between Cases

Currently, major structural changes to PG\&E's rates are typically made in Commission rate-related cases like GRC Phase II or RDW proceedings—or like here, in the instant proceeding. However, rate changes can occur at more frequent intervals than this. To handle such changes, the Commission typically adopts a set of guidelines in PG\&E's GRC Phase II cases for how to perform rate changes between cases. One simple guideline that is currently being used for non-residential rate schedules is to increase or decrease all energy and demand rates by the same identical percentage required in order to collect an increased or decreased revenue requirement. Here PG\&E proposes that a similar "equal percentage change" approach be used for any rate changes that occur after summer 2014 rates have been approved in this proceeding but before the CPUC issues a decision in Phase 1 of this OIR for 2015-with two exceptions to ensure continued progress towards narrowing tier differentials and reducing the CARE discount percentage toward the legislatively mandated range over time.

Specifically, PG\&E proposes the following two guidelines, one applicable to increases in the revenue requirement and the other applicable to decreases: 44

- In the case of revenue requirement increases, the non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates would remain unchanged from PG\&E's proposed summer 2014 rate levels and all other rates (i.e., the non-CARE Tier 1 and 2 rates, along with the CARE Tier 1,2 , and 3 rates) would be increased by an equal percentage so as to collect the incremental revenue amount.
- In the case of revenue requirement decreases, the non-CARE Tier 1 and 2 rates, as well as all CARE rates, would remain at their then-current levels and non-CARE Tier 3 and 4 rates would be decreased by an equal percentage so as to collect the lower revenue amount.

43 A similar approach is also used to design the rates for the CARE versions of the optional TOU and seasonal rates (Schedules EL-6, EL-7 and EL-8).
44 Both guidelines are subject to the proviso that the resulting CARE discount percentage cannot be lower than 30 percent.

These "equal percentage change" guidelines-which may help make further progress in reducing the wide differentials between non-CARE upper- and lower-tier rates, while reducing the CARE discount percentage toward the mandated 30 to 35 percent range-would be used as an interim measure until the Commission adopts a different set of rate designs in a future rate proceeding (e.g., in Phase 1of this proceeding, devoted to rate reforms in 2015 and beyond).

# PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY APPENDIX A ELECTRIC BASELINE QU ANTITIES 

## APPENDIX A ELECTRIC BASELINE QUANTITIES

Baseline quantities are the designated daily amounts of electricity and gas that are considered necessary to supply a significant portion of the reasonable energy needs of the average residential customer. In this amended summer 2014 rate reform filing, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG\&E) is requesting that the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission) adopt updated electric baseline quantities using more current usage data for each climate zone. (PG\&E is not proposing natural gas baseline quantity updates here pursuant to the November 6, 2013 e-mail ruling of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Long in PG\&E's 2014 General Rate Case (GRC) Phase II proceeding (A.13-04-012) ordering that PG\&E's proposed gas baseline quantities will continue to be heard in that proceeding.)

For its electric baseline quantity update, PG\&E proposes to continue using the currently-adopted methodology, per Decision 02-04-026, which resolved the Commission Baseline Rulemaking 01-05-047. This method averages four calendar years ${ }^{1}$ of bill frequency-derived baseline quantities. The current methodology also adjusts for seasonal and vacation home usage, per Decision 04-02-057, as modified in Decision 07-09-004. PG\&E's proposal here uses four years of seasonal usage data, May 2008 through April 2012, as originally filed in PG\&E's 2014 GRC Phase II proceeding. PG\&E's electric baseline quantities were last adjusted in Decision 11-05-047 and implemented on June 20, 2011. At that time, the CPUC also changed the percentage to 55 percent of average usage, except for all-electric and gas baseline quantities in the winter season, which were set at 65 percent of average usage.

The CPUC has already heard PG\&E's proposal to reduce the electric baseline percentage in its pending 2012 Rate Design Window (RDW) proceeding (A.12-02-020)—namely to set the electric baseline quantities at 50 percent of

[^10]average usage. ${ }^{2}$ If adopted in that proceeding, PG\&E's electric baseline quantities would be set at the low end of the range allowed by law. The 2012 RDW has been fully litigated and is pending a Proposed Decision. ${ }^{3}$ This proposal to update the seasonal usage data by climate zone is independent of the 2012 RDW's 50 percent baseline proposal, and is needed even if the CPUC did not adopt any percentage change in that proceeding.

Table A-1 compares the usage and percent of total electric usage by tier forecasted for 2014 for both non-California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and CARE customers using baseline quantities at the current 55 percent level versus the proposed 50 percent level. 4

TABLE A-1
PRESENT AND PROPOSED PERCENT USAGE BY TIER

| Line No. | Tier | Non-CARE Present | Non-CARE Proposed | CARE <br> Present | CARE Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Tier 1 | 57.5\% | 52.6\% | 66.0\% | 59.3\% |
| 2 | Tier 2 | 10.8\% | 10.7\% | 11.0\% | 11.1\% |
| 3 | Tier 3 | 15.8\% | 17.0\% | 14.0\% | 15.7\% |
| 4 | Tier 4 | 15.9\% | 19.7\% | 9.0\% | 13.9\% |
| 5 | Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

(a) Present and proposed percentages are based on forecasted 2014 sales.

As was shown in the testimony received into evidence in Application 12-02-020, reducing the electric baseline quantities to the 50 percent level would lower upper tier non-CARE rates by increasing the amount of upper tier usage over which revenue increases can be spread. Setting PG\&E's baseline quantities at 50 percent, as PG\&E proposes, causes usage exceeding 130 percent of baseline to increase from nearly 32 percent to nearly 37 percent of usage for non-CARE usage, and from 23 percent to nearly 30 percent for CARE usage. Without the proposed changes in

[^11]baseline quantities, PG\&E's proposed non-CARE Tier 3 and Tier 4 rates would need to increase by 2.7 cents per kilowatt-hour (kWh), while all of PG\&E's proposed CARE rates would need to increase by 0.2 cents per kWh , in order to produce the same non-CARE and CARE revenues provided by PG\&E's rate proposals at 50 percent baseline quantities.

PG\&E proposes two additional changes to how it calculates electric baseline quantities for two territories with significant anomalies.

## A. Territory V (Humboldt Area) High Usage Adjustment

The first change relates to Territory $V$ (the Humboldt County coast), where skyrocketing electric usage has caused baseline quantities to spike. Territory V is a coastal climate zone and northerly counterpart to Territory T , the coastal climate zone stretching southward from the Humboldt County border to Santa Barbara. These two territories' usage levels have been historically similar back to 1993 when the basic electric baseline quantities for Territory V were slightly higher than Territory T. 5 However, since 2000, average usage in Territory V , which is used to set baseline quantities, has climbed 38 percent while systemwide residential average usage has declined by 3 percent.

As a result of significant increases in Territory V usage, Territory V would receive some of the highest baseline quantities on PG\&E's system unless action is taken, as PG\&E proposes here. Although enrolled on residential rates, the usage of many Territory V customers seems more analogous to a medium size commercial account. PG\&E compared the number of customers exceeding 400 percent of baseline in Territory V to Territory T and found that there was a significantly higher percentage of these customers in Territory V , and that their average usage was also considerably higher than in Territory T .

The Commission has already recognized the issue of exorbitant usage among a minority of CARE customers in Decision 12-08-044 (some of whom are

[^12]believed to be indoor marijuana growers). ${ }^{6}$ Regardless of the various causes of this usage spike in Territory V , however, the fact that this usage spike did not occur in any other climate zone shows that it is not the result of typical residential usage.

To mitigate the impact of this typical usage on baseline quantities in Territory V, PG\&E recalculated these baseline quantities after removing the highest 2.94 percent of basic and 5.30 percent of all-electric Territory V bills so that the remaining percentage of bills in the 400 percent of baseline category equals the same percentage in Territory T , the climate zone most similar to Territory V. 7

Although this adjustment is data driven and would not be precedential for the future, the CPUC has taken such actions in the past. The CPUC has already approved special adjustments to baseline calculations to remove customers with anomalously low usage levels when it authorized PG\&E to remove bills from baseline calculations to account for vacation and seasonal homes, as well as all-electric customers who use wood or propane as their primary source of heating. Adjusting bills used in baseline calculations to remove the effects of atypical usage further enables baseline quantities to be set according to the intent of the baseline statute, Pub. Util. Code Section 739.(b), which provides that "[T]he commission shall designate a baseline quantity of gas and electricity which is necessary to supply a significant portion of the reasonable energy needs of the average residential customers. The commission shall also take into account differentials in energy use by climactic zone and season."

As a result of this change in methodologies, Territory V baseline quantities would drop an average of 29 percent. However, the absolute gap between Territory V and Territory T baseline quantities would remain substantially higher than it was in 1993.

[^13]7 PG\&E used Territory T for comparison because warmer climate zones, especially those in the Central Valley, have very different usage patterns than coastal zones.
B. Align Territory Q Winter Baseline With Territory P

PG\&E proposes to change the method for determining baseline quantities in Territory Q, a subset of Territory T that covers approximately 3,600 customers in the Santa Cruz Mountains. Currently, Territory Q has the same baseline quantities as Territory T in the summer, but is assigned the moderately higher Territory X baseline quantities in the winter. This change was made in 1989 to reflect the significantly colder winter climate in the Santa Cruz Mountains relative to the rest of coastal Territory T , due to the 1,500 foot or higher elevation of its communities. This colder weather is most acutely felt by all-electric customers who use electricity as their primary source of space heating and comprise two-thirds of the customers in Territory Q.

However, because it is the elevation of the Santa Cruz Mountains that drives higher electric use in the winter, not location, PG\&E believes that it is more appropriate to assign Territory P's higher baseline quantities to Territory Q in the winter, since Territory P's climate more closely matches that of Territory Q in the winter. Like Territory Q , Territory P is a higher elevation climate zone. Territory P includes both Lake County and the Sierra foothills. Its Lake County communities are quite similar to Territory $Q$ communities in that they are just under the 1,500 foot elevation. Its Sierra foothill communities are virtually all within the 1,500 foot to 3,000 foot elevation range.

PG\&E's proposal to change Territory Q's winter baseline to that of Territory $P$ would increase winter baseline quantities for the 3,600 customers in Territory Q by 14 percent for basic customers and 81 percent for all-electric customers, compared to Territory X winter baseline quantities. This increase would more accurately reflect the colder winter climate in Territory Q as compared with Territory X . Currently, average all-electric winter usage in Territory $Q$ is more than double that of Territory $X$, while average basic electric usage in Territory Q is more than a third higher than Territory X . Thus Territory P's winter baseline quantities are more appropriate for use in Territory Q, as PG\&E proposes.

## C. Implementation Timing

PG\&E proposes to implement the proposed electric baseline quantities in one step on the earliest most practicable date, after the effective date of this decision. PG\&E's proposed 50 percent target baseline quantities, based on
updated (2008-2012) load data for individually metered and master meter gas and electric customers, are shown in Table A-2. The baseline quantities at the currently-adopted 55 percent level have also been updated to reflect the 2008-2012 usage data. PG\&E's proposed target baseline quantities, at 50 percent, are shown in bold in Table A-2.

TABLE A-2
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC TARGET BASELINE QUANTITIES BASED ON 2008-2012 USAGE(1)

| TERRITOR | SUMMER (2) |  |  | WINTER (2) |  |  | SUMMER (2) |  |  | WINTER (2) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \% \\ & \text { Daily } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \\ \text { Daily } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Pctg. Chg. | $\begin{gathered} 55 \% \\ \text { Daily } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & \text { Daily } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pctg. } \\ & \text { Chg. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \% \\ & \text { Daily } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & \text { Daily } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pctg. Chg. | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \% \\ & \text { Daily } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & \text { Daily } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pctg Chg. |
|  | E-1, E-6, E-7, E-A7, E-8, E-9, ES, ESR, ET (3) (and CARE) |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { EM (4) } \\ \text { (and CARE) } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ALL-ELECTRIC QUANTITIES (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  | ALL-ELECTRIC QUANTITIES (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | 17.6 | 15.5 | -11.9\% | 29.7 | 28.3 | -4.7\% | 9.7 | 8.6 | -11.3\% | 16.0 | 14.7 | -8.1\% |
| Q | 8.9 | 7.8 | -12.4\% | 30.7 | 28.3 | -7.8\% | 5.8 | 5.2 | -10.3\% | 16.2 | 14.7 | -9.3\% |
| R | 20.2 | 17.8 | -11.9\% | 31.4 | 28.5 | -9.2\% | 9.8 | 8.7 | -11.2\% | 16.3 | 14.5 | -11.0\% |
| S | 17.6 | 15.5 | -11.9\% | 28.7 | 25.8 | -10.1\% | 9.7 | 8.6 | -11.3\% | 16.2 | 14.4 | -11.1\% |
| T | 8.9 | 7.8 | -12.4\% | 16.0 | 13.9 | -13.1\% | 5.8 | 5.2 | -10.3\% | 10.5 | 9.3 | -11.4\% |
| V | 14.7 | 12.8 | -13.1\% | 29.2 | 25.3 | -13.2\% | 11.2 | 7.6 | -32.0\% | 15.8 | 14.1 | -10.8\% |
| W | 22.4 | 19.6 | -12.5\% | 22.0 | 19.3 | -12.3\% | 11.0 | 10.0 | -9.1\% | 13.8 | 12.1 | -12.3\% |
| X | 10.1 | 8.7 | -13.9\% | 18.0 | 15.6 | -13.3\% | 7.9 | 7.1 | -10.1\% | 14.7 | 13.2 | -10.2\% |
| Y | 14.0 | 12.3 | -12.1\% | 28.4 | 25.6 | -9.9\% | 8.5 | 7.7 | -9.4\% | 19.5 | 16.7 | -14.4\% |
| Z | 8.4 | 7.2 | -14.3\% | 20.1 | 17.5 | -12.9\% | 5.1 | 4.5 | -11.8\% | 13.9 | 11.5 | -17.3\% |
|  | BASIC QUANTITIES (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  | BASIC QUANTITIES (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | 14.8 | 13.1 | -11.5\% | 13.1 | 11.7 | -10.7\% | 6.3 | 5.6 | -11.1\% | 5.9 | 5.3 | -10.2\% |
| Q | 7.5 | 6.7 | -10.7\% | 12.9 | 11.7 | -9.3\% | 4.2 | 3.8 | -9.5\% | 6.0 | 5.3 | -11.7\% |
| R | 16.6 | 14.7 | -11.4\% | 11.7 | 10.5 | -10.3\% | 7.1 | 6.3 | -11.3\% | 5.5 | 5.0 | -9.1\% |
| S | 14.8 | 13.1 | -11.5\% | 11.8 | 10.6 | -10.2\% | 6.3 | 5.6 | -11.1\% | 5.5 | 4.9 | -10.9\% |
| T | 7.5 | 6.7 | -10.7\% | 9.0 | 8.0 | -11.1\% | 4.2 | 3.8 | -9.5\% | 5.1 | 4.6 | -9.8\% |
| V | 9.3 | 8.3 | -10.9\% | 11.2 | 10.0 | -10.8\% | 4.6 | 4.1 | -9.9\% | 5.6 | 5.0 | -10.2\% |
| W | 18.0 | 15.9 | -11.7\% | 10.8 | 9.6 | -11.1\% | 7.9 | 7.0 | -11.4\% | 5.9 | 5.3 | -10.2\% |
| X | 10.8 | 9.6 | -11.1\% | 11.5 | 10.3 | -10.4\% | 5.8 | 5.2 | -10.3\% | 6.6 | 5.9 | -10.6\% |
| Y | 11.3 | 10.0 | -11.5\% | 13.3 | 11.9 | -10.5\% | 9.7 | 8.2 | -15.5\% | 9.0 | 7.8 | -13.3\% |
| Z | 6.6 | 5.8 | -12.1\% | 9.6 | 8.4 | -12.5\% | 5.7 | 4.8 | -15.8\% | 6.6 | 5.6 | -15.2\% |

(1) Data is from May 2008 through April 2012.
(2) The Summer season is May through October. The Winter season is November through April.
(3) These baseline allowances cover 98 percent of electric households in PG\&E's service territory.
(4) These baseline allowances cover 2 percent of electric households in PG\&E's service territory.

## PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY <br> APPENDIX B-1

RATE COMPARISON (1): SUMMER 2014 RATES US ING CURRENT RATE DESIGN CONSTRUCT VERSUS SUM MER 2014 RATES USING PROPOSED RATE DESIGN CONSTRUC T

> Pacific Gas and Electric Company
> Exhibit (PG\&E-1), Appendix C (April 18, 2013
> resent and Proposed Rates

| E-1 | PROPOSED SUMMER RATES UNDER CURRENT RATE DESIGN |  |  |  |  |  |  | PROPOSED RATES UNDER MODIFIED RATE DESIGN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credit | CiA | Ofter | Total |  | Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credit | Cla | Ofter | Total |  |
| Energy charge (Skwn) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bastine Usage | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.07702) | . 02500 | . 13627 |  | 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.06579) | . 02500 | . 14707 |  |
| 101\% - $130 \%$ of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.05838) | . 02500 | . 15491 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.04258) | . 02500 | . 17028 |  |
| 131\% - $200 \%$ of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 12632 | . 02500 | . 31931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 09347 | . 02500 | 28603 |  |
| 201\% - $300 \%$ of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | 15347 | . 02500 | 34603 |  |
| Over $309 \%$ of Baseline | 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | 35931 |  | 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | 15347 | . 02500 | 34603 |  |
| minmum charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (\$meteriday) | . 12895 | * | . 00715 |  |  | . 00025 | . 14784 | 4.50 | 12320 | * | . 00699 |  |  | . 00025 | . 14784 | 4.50 |
| (skwwh) |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Energy charge (\$kwh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline Usage | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.07702) | . 02500 | 13627 |  | 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | 00000 | (.06579) | 02500 | 14707 |  |
| $101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline | 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.05838) | . 02500 | . 15491 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.04258) | . 02500 | . 17028 |  |
| 131\%-200\% of Baseine | 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 12632 | . 02500 | . 31931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 09347 | . 02500 | 28603 |  |
| 201\% - $300 \%$ of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
| Over $300 \%$ of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
| minmum charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (\$/meteriday) | . 12895 | * | . 00715 |  |  | . 00025 | . 14784 | 4.50 | 12320 | * | . 00699 |  |  | . 00025 | . 14784 | 4.50 |
| (SkWwh) |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |
| Es ${ }^{\text {ES }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\xrightarrow{\square}$ Esaseline Usage | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.07702) | . 02500 | . 13627 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.06579) | . 02500 | . 14707 |  |
| 1 104\%-130\% of Baseine | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.05838) | . 02500 | . 15491 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.04258) | . 02500 | . 17028 |  |
| - ${ }^{131 \% \text { - } 200 \% \text { of Baseine }}$ | 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 12632 | . 02500 | . 31931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 09347 | . 02500 | . 28603 |  |
| 201\% - $300 \%$ of Baseine | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
| Over 300\% of Baseine | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
| minimum charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (\$mmeteriday) | 12895 | * | . 00715 |  |  | . 00025 | 14784 | 4.50 | 12320 | * | . 00699 |  |  | . 00025 | 14784 | 4.50 |
| (SkWhy) |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |
| discount (Sidweling uniday) | (02300) |  |  |  |  |  | (.02300) | (.70) | (.02300) |  |  |  |  |  | (.02300) | (.70) |
| MARL (SkWn) |  | . 04361 |  |  |  | . 00531 | . 04892 |  |  | . 04361 |  |  |  | . 00531 | . 04892 |  |



$\begin{aligned} & \text { Pacific Gas and Electric Company } \\ & 2014 \text { General Rate Case - Phase II }\end{aligned}$
Exhibt (PG\&E-1), Appendix C (April 18, 2013
Present and Proposed Rates

SUMME
Peak
Baseine Usage
$101 \%$ - $330 \%$ of Base
131\% - 200\% of Baseline
Over 300\% of Easeline
Off-Paeak
Baseine Usage
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Bassefine
$131 \%$ 200\% of Baseline
$201 \%$ - 300\% of Basefine Over $300 \%$ of Baseline

Baseine Usage
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%$ - 200\% of Baseline
$201 \%$ - $300 \%$ of Baseline
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
Off-Peak
Baseeine Usage
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Basefine
$201 \%$ - $300 \%$ of Baseline
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline

MINIMUM CHARGE
(Simeterday)
(S/meterdaz)

E-8
Energy charge (Skwh)
Summer
Baseine Usage
$101 \%-13 \%$ of Baseline
131\%-200\% of Baseline
$201 \%-300 \%$ of Baseline
OVer
Winter
Baseline Usage
$101 \%-130 \%$ of Baselne
$201 \%$ - $300 \%$ of Baseline
BASIC SERVICE FEE (Sismeteriday)

PROPOSED SUMMER RATES UNDER CURRENT RATE DESIGN

| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Crejit | Cla | Ofler | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | .00000 | (.32295) | . 02500 | . 33219 |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.30368) | . 02500 | . 35146 |
| . 14676 | 46911 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.11898) | . 02500 | . 51586 |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.07898) | . 02500 | . 55586 |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.07898) | . 02500 | . 55586 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.09673) | . 02500 | . 08404 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.07747) | . 02500 | . 10330 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 10723 | . 02500 | 26770 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 14723 | . 02500 | . 30770 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 14723 | . 02500 | . 30770 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | .00000 | (.29221) | . 02500 | . 11769 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.27295) | . 02500 | . 13695 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.08825) | . 02500 | . 30135 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.04825) | . 02500 | . 34135 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.04825) | . 02500 | . 34135 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.05163) | . 02500 | . 08765 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.03237) | . 02500 | . 10691 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 15233 | . 02500 | . 27131 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 19233 | . 02500 | . 31131 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 19233 | . 02500 | . 31131 |
| . 13518 | * | . 00716 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & .00025 \\ & .02417 \end{aligned}$ | . 14784 |
| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Creait | Cla | Ofter | Fotal |


| Distr | Gen | PPP | 332 Creait | Cia | Oither | Tolal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | . 00000 | (.14293) | . 02500 | . 14078 |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | . 00000 | (.14293) | . 02500 | . 14078 |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 04177 | . 02500 | . 30518 |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 08177 | . 02500 | . 34518 |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 08177 | . 02500 | . 34518 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | . 00000 | (.11094) | . 02500 | . 09015 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | . 00000 | (.11094) | . 02500 | . 09015 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 07376 | . 02500 | . 25455 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 13776 | . 02500 | . 29455 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | (.02030) | 11376 | . 02500 | 29455 |

PROPOSED RATES UNDER MODIFIED RATE DESIGN

| Distr | Gen | pPP | AB32 Credit | Cla | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 14688 | . 46911 | . 01383 | . 00000 | (.31183) | . 02500 | . 34299 |
| . 14688 | 46911 | . 01383 | . 00000 | (.28799) | . 02500 | . 36683 |
| . 14688 | 46911 | . 01383 | (.02030) | (.15194) | . 02500 | . 48258 |
| . 14688 | . 46911 | . 01383 | (.02030) | (.09194) | . 02500 | . 54258 |
| . 14688 | . 46911 | . 01383 | (.02030) | (.09194) | . 02500 | . 54258 |
| . 05875 | . 08280 | . 01383 | . 00000 | (.08554) | . 02500 | . 09484 |
| . 05875 | . 08280 | . 01383 | . 00000 | (.06171) | . 02500 | . 11867 |
| . 05875 | . 08280 | . 01383 | (.02030) | 07434 | . 02500 | . 23442 |
| . 05875 | . 08280 | . 01383 | (.02030) | 13434 | . 02500 | . 29442 |
| . 05875 | . 08280 | . 01383 | (.02030) | 13434 | . 02500 | . 29442 |
| . 06586 | . 30483 | . 01383 | . 00000 | (.28103) | . 02500 | . 12849 |
| . 06586 | . 30483 | . 01383 | . 00000 | (.25720) | . 02500 | . 15232 |
| . 06586 | . 30483 | . 01383 | (.02030) | (.12115) | . 02500 | . 26807 |
| . 06586 | . 30483 | . 01383 | (.02030) | (.06115) | . 02500 | . 32807 |
| . 06586 | . 30483 | . 01383 | (.02030) | (.06115) | . 02500 | . 32807 |
| . 04390 | . 05615 | . 01383 | . 00000 | (.04043) | . 02500 | . 09845 |
| . 04390 | . 05615 | . 01383 | . 00000 | (.01660) | . 02500 | . 12228 |
| . 04390 | . 05615 | . 01383 | (.02030) | . 11946 | . 02500 | . 23804 |
| . 04390 | . 05615 | . 01383 | (.02030) | . 17946 | . 02500 | . 29804 |
| . 04390 | . 05615 | . 01383 | (.02030) | . 17946 | . 02500 | . 29804 |

$00025-14784-4.50$

| Distr | Gan | ppp | AB32 Creait | CA | Other | ctal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 04340 | . 19994 | . 01497 | . 00000 | (.13173) | . 02500 | . 15158 |
| . 04340 | . 19994 | . 01497 | . 00000 | (.12716) | . 02500 | . 15615 |
| . 04340 | . 19994 | . 01497 | (.02030) | . 00889 | . 02500 | . 27190 |
| . 04340 | . 19994 | . 01497 | (.02030) | . 06889 | . 02500 | . 33190 |
| . 04340 | . 19994 | . 01497 | (.02030) | . 06889 | . 02500 | . 33190 |
| . 02894 | . 13177 | . 01497 | . 00000 | (.09973) | . 02500 | . 10095 |
| . 02894 | . 13177 | . 01497 | . 00000 | (.09516) | . 02500 | . 10552 |
| . 02894 | . 13177 | . 01497 | (.02030) | . 04089 | . 02500 | . 22127 |
| . 02894 | . 13177 | . 01497 | (.02030) | 10089 | . 02500 | . 28127 |
| . 02894 | . 13177 | . 01497 | (.02030) | 10089 | . 02500 | 28127 |

12.53



## EVA FElectic Venicles)

Energy charge (skwh)

| Summer |
| :---: |
| Peak |

Peak
PartPeak
Pr
Wifter
Part-pak
PatPeok
minimum charge
Simeterdar

B (Electric Vehicles)
Energy charge (\$Kwh)
Sunmer
${ }^{\text {Peark }}$ Peak
Of-Peak

| Winter |
| :--- |
| Part:Pa |


| Pat.PBak |
| :--- |
| PattPeek |

Off-Peak

PROPOSED SUMMER RATES UNDER CURRENT RATE DESIGN

| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Cresitit | CIA | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .16343 | .22784 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .42311 |
| .08172 | .10980 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .0500 | .22336 |
| .01177 | .05518 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .09879 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .17556 | .08514 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .29254 |
| .08778 | .05319 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .17281 |
| .01264 | .05715 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .10163 |

12895

| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Cresit | CiA | Oither | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .15806 | .22784 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .41774 |
| .07903 | .10880 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .22067 |
| .01138 | .05518 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .09840 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .16980 | .08514 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .28678 |
| .08490 | .05319 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .16993 |
| .01223 | .05715 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .10122 |

PROPOSED RATES UNDER MODIFIED RATE DESIGN

| Distr | Genn | PPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Ofther | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .16341 | .22785 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .42265 |
| .08171 | .10981 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .22291 |
| .01177 | .05518 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .09834 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .085477 | .08515 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .29208 |
| .01264 | .05319 | .01830 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .17235 |
|  |  | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .10118 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12320 |  |  |  |  |  | 14784 |

4.50


| EsRL |  | PROPOSED SUMMER RATES UNDER CURRENT RATE DESIGN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PROPOSED RATES UNDER MODIFIED RATE DESIGN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credit | CiA | Ofler | Total |  | Distr | Gen | ppp | AB32 Creatit | Cia | Ofter | Fotal |  |
| ENERGY CHARGE (Sfinh ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Baseine Usage | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.03314) | . 01987 | 08565 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.03261) | . 01987 | . 09072 |  |
|  | 101\% - $130 \%$ of Baseline | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.02029) | . 01987 | . 09850 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.01900) | . 01987 | . 10433 |  |
|  | 131\%-200\% of Baseline | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02095 | . 01987 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | 20\%\% - $300 \%$ of Baseline | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02095 | . 01987 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | Over 300\% of Easeline | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02095 | . 01987 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
| Non-CARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bastife Usage | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.07702) | . 02500 | . 13627 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.06579) | . 02500 | . 14707 |  |
|  | 101\% - 130\% of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.05838) | . 02500 | . 15491 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.04258) | . 02500 | . 17028 |  |
|  | $134 \%$ - $200 \%$ of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 12632 | . 02500 | . 31931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 09347 | . 02500 | 28603 |  |
|  | 20\%\%-300\% of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
|  | Over $300 \%$ of Easeline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
| minmum charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (\$'meereriday) | . 09922 | * | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | 11828 | 3.60 | 09363 | * | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | 11828 | 3.60 |
|  | ( s kWh ) |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |
|  | EtL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Energy charge (Sfrwh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Baseine Usage | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.03314) | . 01987 | . 08565 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.03261) | . 01987 | . 09072 |  |
|  | 101\% - 130\% of Baseline | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.02029) | . 01987 | . 09850 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.01900) | . 01987 | . 10433 |  |
|  | 131\% - $200 \%$ of Baseline | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02095 | . 01987 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | 201\%-300\% of Baseline | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02095 | . 01987 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
| $\infty$ | Over 300\% of Easeline | (.00234) | . 09483 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02095 | . 01987 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
| 0 | Non-CARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Baseife Usage | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.07702) | . 02500 | . 13627 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.06579) | . 02500 | . 14707 |  |
|  | 104\%-130\% of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.05838) | . 02500 | . 15491 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.04258) | . 02500 | . 17028 |  |
|  | $131 \%$ - $200 \%$ of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 12632 | . 02500 | . 31931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | .09347 | . 02500 | . 28603 |  |
|  | 201\%-300\% of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
|  | Over 300\% of Baseline | . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | 35931 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
|  | minmum charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (S'meteriday) | . 09922 |  | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | . 11828 | 3.60 | 09363 |  | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | 11828 | 3.60 |
|  | (\$kkw) |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 02417 |  |  |
|  | DISCOUNT (S/dwelling unitday) | . 07721 |  |  |  |  |  | . 07721 | 2.35 | . 07721 |  |  |  |  |  | . 07721 | 2.35 |
|  | MARL [CARE \& Medical Baselin Units) (Skkwn) |  | * |  |  |  | . 00531 | . 04892 |  |  | * |  |  |  | . 00531 | . 04892 |  |

MARL [CARE \& Medical Baseline Units) (Skiwn)



# PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY APPENDIX B -2 

## RATE COMPARISON (2): SB 695 -ADJUSTED RATES VERSUS SUMMER 2014 RATES US ING PROPOSED <br> RATE DESIGN CONSTRUC T

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Pacific Gas and Electric Company }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Present and Proposed Rates }
\end{aligned}
$$



EsR
Energy Charge（\＄kyh） Easeline Usage
101\％－130\％of Baseline
$131 \%$ ． $200 \%$ of Baselin
$201 \%-300 \%$ of Baselin
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
minimum charge
\＄imelerday）
（\＄kWM）

ET
ENERGY CHARGE（SKWVM） Easeline Usage
$101 \%-130 \%$ of
$101 \%$－ $130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Baselin
$201 \%-300 \%$ of Baselin
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
minimum charge
（simetercay）
（ $\ddagger$ ： K （Wh）
discount（scduveling unilday）
MARL（\＄k．NH）

1／1／2014 RATES MODIFIED FOR SB 695 RATE INCREASE

| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Olher | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.05850)$ | .02617 | .13627 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.03986)$ | .02617 | .15491 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .11876 | .02617 | .31353 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .15876 | .02617 | .35353 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .15876 | .02617 | .35353 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .12447 | $*$ | .00670 |  |  | .00025 | .14784 |

.0258

| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credil | CIA | olter | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Disir | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credil | CIA | Oilher | Tolal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.05850)$ | .02617 | .13627 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.03986)$ | .02617 | .15491 |
| .08885 | .0852 | .01323 | .0000 | 1186 | .0217 | 31353 |


| .0885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.03986)$ | .02617 | .15491 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .06855 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .11876 | .02617 | .135 |


| 0885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .11876 | .02617 | .31353 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .15876 | .02617 | .35353 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .15876 | .02617 | .35353 |

12447 ＊． $00670 \quad .00025$ ． 14784
2
4.5
2.35
.00877 ． 04892

PROPOSED RATES UNDER MODIFIED RATE DESIGN

| Distr | Gen | pPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ． 07924 | ． 09482 | ． 01380 | ． 00000 | （．06579） | ． 02500 | ． 14707 |
| ． 07924 | ． 09482 | ． 01380 | ． 00000 | （．04258） | ． 02500 | ． 17028 |
| ． 07924 | ． 09482 | ． 01380 | （．02030） | ． 09347 | ． 02500 | ． 28603 |
| ． 07924 | ． 09482 | ． 01380 | （．02030） | ． 15347 | ． 02500 | ． 34603 |
| ． 07924 | ． 09482 | ． 01380 | （．02030） | ． 15347 | ． 02500 | ． 34603 |
| ． 12320 | ＊ | ． 00699 |  |  | ． 00025 | ． 14784 |

． 0258

| Distr Gen | PPP | AB32 Credil | CliA | Olter | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| .07994 | .09482 | .01380 | .00000 | $(06579)$ | .02500 | .14707 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .07924 | .09482 | .01830 | .00000 | $(.04258)$ | .02500 | .17028 |


| 7924 | .09482 | .01380 | .00000 | $(.06579)$ | .02500 | .14707 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7924 | .09482 | .013880 | $(.00000$ | $(.04258)$ | .02500 | .17028 |
| .02309 | .09347 | .02500 | .28603 |  |  |  |
| .7924 | .09482 | .01380 | $(.02030)$ | .15347 | .02500 | .34603 |
| 7924 | .09482 | .01380 | $(.02030)$ | .15347 | .02500 | .34603 |

.000214784
.07721.04892


> Pacific Gas and Electric Company
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2014 General Rate Case - Phase II } \\ & \text { Exhibit (PG\&E-1) Appendix C (April } 18 \text {, 2013 }\end{aligned}$
> Present and Proposed Rates

SUMME
Peak
Baseline Usage
101\%-130\% of Baseline
$131 \%$ - 200\% of Baseline
201\%-300\% of Baseline
offreak
Baseline Usage
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Baseline
201\%-300\% of Baseline Over 300\% of Baseline

Peak
Baseline Usage
101\% - $130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%$ - $200 \%$ of Baseline
$201 \%$, $300 \%$ of Baseline
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
Offereak
Baseline Usage
101\% - $130 \%$ of Baseline
201\%-300\% or Baselline
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
minmum charge
Tmeterday

E-8
energy charge (skvin)
Summer
Base ine Usage
101\% $130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%$ - 200\% of Baseline
$201 \%$ - $300 \%$ of Baseline
Winter
Baseline Usage
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline
131\%-200\% of Baselline
201\% - $300 \%$ of Baseline
Over 300\% of Baseline
basic service fee (s'meteriday)

1/1/2014 RATES MODIFIED FOR SB 695 RATE INCREASE

| Distr | Gen | ppp | AB32 Credit | CIA | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.26283) | . 02617 | . 33219 |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.24356) | . 02617 | . 35146 |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.08494) | . 02617 | . 51008 |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.04494) | . 02617 | . 55008 |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.04494) | . 02617 | . 55008 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.08196) | . 02617 | . 08404 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.06270) | . 02617 | . 10330 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | . 09592 | . 02617 | . 26192 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | 13592 | . 02617 | . 30192 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | . 13592 | . 02617 | . 30192 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (25707) | . 02617 | . 11769 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.23781) | . 02617 | . 13695 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.07919) | . 02617 | . 29557 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.03919) | . 02617 | . 33557 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.03919) | . 02617 | . 33557 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.04113) | . 02617 | . 08765 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.02187) | . 02617 | . 10691 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | . 13676 | . 02617 | . 26554 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | . 17676 | . 02617 | . 30554 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | . 17676 | . 02617 | . 30554 |
| . 13169 | * | . 00671 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & .00025 \\ & .02583 \end{aligned}$ | . 14784 |
| Disir | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credil | CIA | Other | Total |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | (.11831) | . 02617 | 14078 |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | (.11831) | . 02617 | . 14078 |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 04031 | . 02617 | . 29940 |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 08031 | . 02617 | . 33940 |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 08031 | . 02617 | . 33940 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | (.09470) | . 02617 | . 09015 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | (.09470) | . 02617 | . 09015 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 06392 | . 02617 | . 24877 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 10392 | . 02617 | . 28877 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 10392 | . 02617 | . 28877 |
| . 41160 |  |  |  |  |  | . 41160 |

PROPOSED RATES UNDER MODIFIED RATE DESIGN




> Pacific Gas and Electric Company
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2014 General Rate Case - Phase II } \\ & \text { Exhibit (PG\&E-1), Appendix C (April } 18 \text {, 2013) } \\ & \text { Present and Proposed Res. }\end{aligned}$
> Present and Proposed Rates


Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2014 General Rate Case - Phase II Exhibit (PG\&E-1), Appendix C C Aprili 18, 2013 Present and Proposed Rates

EVA (Electric Vehicles)
energy charge (skyth)
Summer
Peak
Part-Peak
Ofleak
Offle
Part-Peak
Part-Peak
minimum charge
Minmul CH
(sik Wh $)$

EVB (Electric Vehicles)
Energy charge (skwh)
Summer
Peak
Peak
Part-Peak
он-Peak
winter
Part-Peak
Patt-Peak
off-Peak

| Distr | Gen | pPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Oilher | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 14053 | . 20573 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | 38566 |
| . 07026 | . 09915 | . 01323 | . 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 20881 |
| . 01012 | . 04982 | . 01323 | . 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 09934 |
| . 15096 | . 07688 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | 02617 | 26724 |
| . 07548 | . 04802 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 16290 |
| . 01087 | . 05160 | . 01323 | . 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 10187 |
| . 12447 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Other | Total |
| . 13516 | . 20573 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 38029 |
| . 06758 | . 09915 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 20613 |
| . 00973 | . 04982 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 09895 |
| . 14519 | . 07688 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 26147 |
| . 07260 | . 04802 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 16002 |
| . 01045 | . 05160 | . 01323 | 00000 | . 00000 | . 02617 | . 10145 |


| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Olther | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .16341 | .22785 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .42265 |
| .08171 | .10981 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .22291 |
| .01177 | .05518 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .09834 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .08554 | .08515 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .29208 |
| .01264 | .05319 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .17335 |
|  | 05715 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .10118 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .12320 |  |  |  |  |  | .14784 |

4.50

| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credil | CIA | Oiner | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .15804 | .22785 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .41728 |
| .07902 | .0981 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .22022 |
| .01138 | .05518 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .09795 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .16978 | .08515 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .28632 |
| .0489 | .05319 | .01330 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .16477 |
| .05715 | .01380 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .10076 |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Pacific Gas and Electric Company }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Present and Proposed Rates }
\end{aligned}
$$

|  | EL-1 | 1/1/2014 RATES MODIFIED FOR SB 695 RATE INCREASE |  |  |  |  |  |  | PROPOSED RATES UNDER MODIFIED RATE DESIGN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Distr | Gen | ppp | AB32 Creait | CIA | Oller | Total |  | Distr | Gen | pPP | AB32 Credit | Cla | Other | Total |  |
|  | ENERGY CHARGE (SkYh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Baseine Usage | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.02619) | . 02104 | 08565 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.03261) | . 01987 | . 09072 |  |
|  | 101\%-130\% of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.01334) | . 02104 | 09850 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.01900) | . 01987 | . 10433 |  |
|  | 131\% - $200 \%$ of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | 201\%-30\% of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | Over $300 \%$ of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | minimum charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (simelerrday) | . 09495 | * | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | . 11828 | 3.60 | . 09363 | * | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | . 11828 | 3.60 |
|  | (\$..WY) |  |  |  |  |  | . 02070 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 02070 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ENERGY CHARGE (SKWVI) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Baseline Usage | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | 00000 | (.02619) | . 02104 | . 08565 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | 00000 | (.03261) | . 01987 | . 09072 |  |
|  | 101\% - 130\% of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.01334) | . 02104 | . 09850 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | (.01900) | . 01987 | . 10433 |  |
|  | $131 \%$ - $200 \%$ of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | 201\% - 300\% of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | Over $300 \%$ of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | minimum charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (simetercay) | 09495 | * | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | 11828 | 3.60 | . 09363 | * | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | . 11828 | 3.60 |
|  | (\$kWH) |  |  |  |  |  | . 02070 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 02070 |  |  |
|  | ESL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\infty$ | ENERGY CHARGE (SKWWh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | CARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\infty$ | Baselin Usage | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | 00000 | (.02619) | . 02104 | . 08565 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | 00000 | (.03261) | . 01987 | . 09072 |  |
|  | 101\% - $130 \%$ of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | 00000 | (.01334) | . 02104 | . 09850 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | 00000 | (.01900) | . 01987 | . 10433 |  |
|  | 131\%-200\% of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | 201\%-300\% of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | Over $300 \%$ of Baseline | (.00215) | . 08652 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02790 | . 02104 | . 13974 |  | . 00221 | . 09482 | . 00643 | . 00000 | . 02469 | . 01987 | . 14802 |  |
|  | Non-CARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Baseline Usage | 06885 | . 08652 | . 01323 | 00000 | (.05850) | . 02617 | . 13627 |  | . 07924 | 09482 | . 01380 | 00000 | (.06579) | . 02500 | . 14707 |  |
|  | 101\% - 130\% of Baseline | 06885 | . 08652 | . 01323 | 00000 | (.03986) | . 02617 | . 15491 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | . 00000 | (.04258) | . 02500 | . 17028 |  |
|  | 131\%-200\% of Baseline | . 06885 | . 08652 | . 01323 | . 00000 | . 11876 | . 02617 | . 31353 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 09347 | . 02500 | . 28603 |  |
|  | 201\% - 300\% of Baseline | . 06885 | . 08652 | . 01323 | . 00000 | . 15876 | . 02617 | . 35353 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
|  | Over $300 \%$ of Baseline | . 06885 | . 08652 | . 01323 | . 00000 | . 15876 | . 02617 | . 35353 |  | . 07924 | . 09482 | . 01380 | (.02030) | . 15347 | . 02500 | . 34603 |  |
|  | minimum charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (simetercay) | 09495 | * | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | . 11828 | 3.60 | 09363 | * | . 00371 |  |  | . 00028 | . 11828 | 3.60 |
|  | (\$\%MW) |  |  |  |  |  | . 02583 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 02583 |  |  |
|  | DISCOUNT (S'duveling unitday) | (.02300) |  |  |  |  |  | (.02300) | (70) | (.02300) |  |  |  |  |  | (.02300) | (.70) |
|  | MARL [CARE \& Medical Baseline Units] (skwh) |  | * |  |  |  | . 00877 | 04892 |  |  | * |  |  |  | . 00877 | . 04892 |  |
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# PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY APPENDIX B -3 

RATE COMPARISON (3): SB 695 -ADJUSTED RATES VERSUS SUMMER 2014 RATES US ING CURRENT RATE DESIGN CONSTRUC T

> Pacific Gas and Electric Company
> Exhibit (PG\&E-1), Appendix C - Aprasil 18 , 2013
> Present and Proposed Rates


Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2014 General Rate Case- - Phase II
2014 General Rate Case - Phase Il
Exhibit (PG\&E-1), Appenclix C (April 18, 2013)
Present and Proposed Rates
Present and Proposed Rates

EsR
Energy Charge (\$kyh) Easeline Usage
101\%-130\% of Baseline
$131 \%$. $200 \%$ of Baselin
$201 \%-300 \%$ of Baselin
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
minimum charge
\$imelerday)
(\$kWM)

ET
ENERGY CHARGE (SkWh) Easeline Usage
$101 \%-130 \%$ of
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Baselin
$201 \%-300 \%$ of Baselin
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
minimum charge
(simetercay)
( $(\mathrm{F} k \nmid \mathrm{~Wh})$
DIscount (stdwelling unilday)
MARL (\$. KWHT )

1/1/2014 RATES MODIFIED FOR SB 695 RATE INCREASE

| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Olher | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.05850)$ | .02617 | .13627 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.03986)$ | .02617 | .15491 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .11876 | .02617 | .31353 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .15876 | .02617 | .35353 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .15876 | .02617 | .35353 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .12447 | $*$ | .00670 |  |  | .00025 | .14784 |

.00025

| Distr Gen $\quad$ PPP | AB32 Credil | CIA | olter | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Disir | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credil | CIA | Oiner | Tolal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.05850)$ | .02617 | .13627 |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.03986)$ | .02617 | .15491 |
| .08885 | .08552 | .0323 | .00000 | 1186 | .0217 | 31353 |


| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | $(.03986)$ | .02617 | .15491 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .11876 | .02617 | .31353 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .06885 | .08652 | .01323 | .00000 | .15876 | .02617 | .35353 |
|  | .01323 | .00000 | .15876 | .02617 | .35353 |  |

12447 * $00670 \quad .00025$. 14784
2
4.5
2.35
.00877 . 04892

PROPOSED RATES UNDER CURRENT RATE DESIGN

. 0258

| Distr | Gen | pPp | AB32 Creail | CIA | Olther | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.07702) | . 02500 | . 13627 |
| . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | . 00000 | (.05838) | . 02500 | . 15491 |
| . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | 12632 | . 02500 | . 31931 |
| . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |
| . 07921 | . 09483 | . 01425 | (.02030) | . 16632 | . 02500 | . 35931 |
| . 12895 | * | . 00715 |  |  | . 00025 | . 14784 |
|  |  |  |  |  | . 02583 |  |
| . 07721 |  |  |  |  |  | . 07721 |



> Pacific Gas and Electric Company
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2014 General Rate Case - Phase II } \\ & \text { Exhibit (PG\&E-1) Appendix C (April } 18 \text {, 2013 }\end{aligned}$
> (PGese-1), Appendix C (APrit

ENERGY CHARGE (SkYWh)
SUMMER
Baseline Usage
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Baseline
201\%- 300\% of Baseline
Over 300\% of Baseline
Off-Peak
Baseline Usage
$101 \%-130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Baseline
201\% - 300\% of Baseline Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
$\underset{\text { Peak }}{\text { WINTER }}$
Baseline Usage
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline
131\%-200\% of Baseline
$201 \%$ - $300 \%$ of Baseline
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
Offereak
Baseline Usage
$101 \%-130 \%$ of Baseline
$131 \%-200 \%$ of Baseline
201\%-300\% of Baseline
Over $300 \%$ of Baseline
minimum charge
(Simelerfday)
(sikvy)

E-8
energy charge (skvin)
Summer
Baseine Usage
101\% - $130 \%$ of Baseline
131\%-200\% of Baseline
$201 \%$. 300\% of Baseline
Winter
Baseline Usage
$101 \%$ - $130 \%$ of Baseline
131\%-200\% of Baseline
201\% - $300 \%$ of Baseline
Over 300\% of Baseline
basic service fee (s'meteriday)

1/1/2014 RATES MODIFIED FOR SB 695 RATE INCREASE

| Distr | Gen | pPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Ollher | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.26283) | . 02617 | 33219 |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.24356) | . 02617 | . 35146 |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.08494) | . 02617 | 51008 |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | 00000 | (.04494) | . 02617 | 55008 |
| . 12757 | . 42803 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.04494) | . 02617 | 55008 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.08196) | . 02617 | . 08404 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.06270) | . 02617 | . 10330 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | 09592 | . 02617 | . 26192 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | 13592 | . 02617 | . 30192 |
| . 05103 | . 07555 | . 01325 | . 00000 | 13592 | . 02617 | 30192 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (25707) | . 02617 | 11769 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.23781) | . 02617 | . 13695 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.07919) | . 02617 | . 29557 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.03919) | . 02617 | . 33557 |
| . 05720 | . 27814 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.03919) | . 02617 | . 33557 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | 00000 | (.04113) | . 02617 | 08765 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | (.02187) | . 02617 | 10691 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | . 13676 | . 02617 | . 26554 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | . 17676 | . 02617 | . 30554 |
| . 03813 | . 05123 | . 01325 | . 00000 | . 17676 | . 02617 | . 30554 |
| . 13169 | * | . 00671 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & .00025 \\ & .02583 \end{aligned}$ | . 14784 |
| Distr | Gen | ppp | AB32 Credit | CIA | Olner | Total |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | 00000 | (.11831) | . 02617 | 14078 |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | (.11831) | . 02617 | . 14078 |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 04031 | . 02617 | . 29940 |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 08031 | . 02617 | . 33940 |
| . 03610 | . 18243 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 08031 | . 02617 | . 33940 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | (.09470) | . 02617 | . 09015 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | (.09470) | . 02617 | . 09015 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 06392 | . 02617 | . 24877 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 10392 | . 02617 | . 28877 |
| . 02406 | . 12023 | . 01439 | . 00000 | . 10392 | . 02617 | . 28877 |
| . 41160 |  |  |  |  |  | . 41160 |

PROPOSED RATES UNDER CURRENT RATE DESIGN

| Distr | Gen | pPp | AB32 Credit | CIA | Ollher | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.32295) | . 02500 | . 33219 |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.30368) | . 02500 | . 35146 |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.11898) | . 02500 | . 51586 |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.07898) | . 02500 | 55586 |
| . 14676 | . 46911 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.07898) | . 02500 | 55586 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.09673) | . 02500 | . 08404 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.07747) | . 02500 | . 10330 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 10723 | . 02500 | . 26770 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | (.02030) | 14723 | . 02500 | . 30770 |
| . 05870 | . 08280 | . 01427 | (.02030) | 14723 | . 02500 | 30770 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (29221) | . 02500 | 11769 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.27295) | . 02500 | . 13695 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.08825) | . 02500 | . 30135 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.04825) | . 02500 | . 34135 |
| . 06580 | . 30483 | . 01427 | (.02030) | (.04825) | . 02500 | . 34135 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.05163) | . 02500 | . 08765 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | . 00000 | (.03237) | . 02500 | 10691 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | (.02030) | 15233 | . 02500 | . 27131 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 19233 | . 02500 | . 31131 |
| . 04386 | . 05615 | . 01427 | (.02030) | . 19233 | . 02500 | . 31131 |

.00025 . 14784

| Distr | Gen | ppp | AB32 Credil | CIA | Other | Tolal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | . 00000 | (.14293) | . 02500 | . 14078 |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | . 00000 | (.14293) | . 02500 | . 14078 |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 04177 | . 02500 | . 30518 |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 08177 | . 02500 | . 34518 |
| . 04336 | . 19994 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 08177 | . 02500 | . 34518 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | . 00000 | (.11094) | . 02500 | . 09015 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | . 00000 | (.11094) | . 02500 | . 09015 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 07376 | . 02500 | . 25455 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 11376 | . 02500 | . 29455 |
| . 02891 | . 13177 | . 01541 | (.02030) | . 11376 | . 02500 | . 29455 |



> Pacific Gas and Electric Company
> $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2014 General Rate Case - Phase II } \\ & \text { Exhibit (PG\&E-1), Appendix C (April } 18 \text {, 2013) } \\ & \text { Present and Proposed Ret }\end{aligned}$
> Present and Proposed Rates


Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2014 General Rate Case - Phase II Exhibit (PG\&E-1), Appendix C C Aprili 18, 2013 Present and Proposed Rates

EVA (Electric Vehicles)
energy charge (skyth)
Summer
Peak
Part-Peak
Ofleak
Off-Pea
Part-Peak
Part-Peak
minimum charge
Minmul CH
( $(\mathrm{F}, \mathrm{WYh}$ )

EVB (Electric Vehicles)
EnERGY CHARGE (skNun)
Summer
Peak
Peak
Part-Peak
oit-Peak
Winter
PattPe
Part-Peak
Patt-Peak
off-Peak

PROPOSED RATES UNDER CURRENT RATE DESIGN

| Distr | Gen | PPP | AB32 Credit | CIA | Olher | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| .16343 | .22784 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .42311 |
| .08172 | .10980 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .22336 |
| .01177 | .05518 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .09879 |
| .17556 | .08514 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .29254 |
| .08778 | .05319 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .17281 |
| .01264 | .05715 | .01425 | $(.00741)$ | .00000 | .02500 | .10163 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | .14784 |

4.50
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## PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY <br> APPENDIX C-1

BILL COMPARISON (1): SUMMER 2014 RATES US ING CURRENT RATE DESIGN CONSTRUCT VERSUS SUM MER 2014 RATES USING PROPOSED RATE DESIGN CONSTRUC T

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAST } \\ & \text { RATE } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | total annual | CURRENT | TOTAE ANHOE | PROPOSED | DIFPERENCE (RROPOSED - | (PROROSEDcurrent) / CURRENT |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| schedues | count | annuas totat kwh | Current milis | avg rate | PROPOSED BILLS | Avg rate | CURRENT) |  |  | MAX DEFPERENCE | Min differbnce |
| E1 | 2,815,104 | 18,278,276,127 | \$3,899,789,361 | 0.21336 | \$3,880,536,079 | 0.21230 | \$-19,253,282 | ( | 0.49\%) | \$495 | \$-28,488 |
| E1L | 1,156,472 | 7,576,011, 370 | \$790,535,519 | 0.10435 | \$837,332,506 | 0.11052 | \$46,796,987 |  | 5.92\% | \$1.637 | \$-0 |
| E6 | 5.462 | 52,512,188 | \$12,645,724 | 0.24082 | \$12,382,884 | 0.23581 | \$-262,840 | ( | 2.08\%) | \$133 | \$-6,521 |
| E6L | 379 | 6,078,576 | \$691,677 | 0.11379 | \$735,083 | 0.12093 | \$43,406 |  | 6.28\% | \$1,066 | \$4 |
| E7 | 57.773 | 606,295,672 | \$126,926,479 | 0.20935 | \$124,548,269 | 0.20542 | \$-2,378,210 | ( | 1.87\%) | \$373 | \$-2,650 |
| E7L | 7.757 | 84,873,446 | \$9,142,777 | 0.10772 | \$9,589,748 | 0.11417 | \$546, 971 |  | 5.98\% | \$1,472 | \$0 |
| 玉8 | 43,911 | 675,567.529 | \$159,040,025 | 0.23542 | \$154,867,925 | 0.22924 | \$-4,172,099 | $($ | 2.62\%) | \$437 | \$-5,846 |
| E8L | 8,692 | 136,763,391 | \$13,996,667 | 0.10234 | \$14,921,799 | 0.10911 | \$925, 133 |  | 6.61\% | \$4,252 | \$0 |
| TORAL | 4,095,548 | 27,416, 778,899 | \$5,012,768,228 | 0.18284 | \$5,035,014,294 | 0.18365 | \$22,246,065 |  | $0.44 \%$ | \$9,866 | \$-44,502 |

CORELATION OF AVERAGE MONTHLY DOLLAR AND PERCEMY DITFERENCES
Comparison Between Summer 2014 rates under current rules on $50 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
AND Summer 2014 rates under proposed new rate design rules on 508 BQ
FOR AMNUAL
Bill Comparison \#1 / Data From Yearly File (JAN 2011 - Dec 2011
RES full service



|  | MONTHLY | BELOW－20\％ | －20－－10\％ | $-10--5{ }^{\text {－}}$ | －5－0．01咅 | －0．01－0\％ | 0－0．01\％ | 0．01－5\％ | 5－10\％ | $10-20 \frac{8}{5}$ | ABOVE 20\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCT D | DTFFERENCE | decrease | decreasz | decreasm | DECREASE | DECREASE | increase | Incriase | Increase | increase |  |
| 4\％ | \＄－22．23 | 0 | 0 | $7(0.18)$ | 212（3．9\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $8 \%$ | \＄－13．59 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 （0．0） 0 ） | 218 （4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12\％ | \＄－10．2．7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 （4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16\％ | \＄－8．16 | 0 | 0 | 1 （0．0\％） | 220（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20\％ | \＄－6．70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 （4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24\％ | \＄－5．49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 （4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $28 \%$ | \＄－4．59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 （4．18） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 32\％ | \＄－3．72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 （4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 36. | \＄－3．03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 （4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 407 | \＄－2．40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 （3．0考） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 443 | \＄－1．80 | － | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 219 （4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 48. | \＄－1．30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $218(4.0 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 52\％ | \＄－0．78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223 （4．18） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 56\％ | \＄－0．31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215（3．98） | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 60\％ | \＄0．10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 （2．4\％） | 1 （0．0\％） | 23 （0．48） | 60 （1．1年） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 64\％ | \＄0．48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 226 （4．17\％） | 1（0．0\％） | 0 | 0 |
| 68\％ | \＄0．84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 （3．88） | 4 （0．1娄） | 0 | 0 |
| 72.8 | \＄1．16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 （3．58） | 26 （0．5\％） | 0 | 0 |
| 764 | \＄1．45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 （3．3\％） | $38(0.78)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 80： | \＄1．72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 （2．98） | 67（2．2告） | 0 | 0 |
| 84\％ | \＄2．05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 127（2．3\％） | 86（1．6\％） | 0 | 0 |
| 88\％ | \＄2．38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101．（1．88） | 118 （2．2\％） | 0 | 0 |
| $92 \%$ | \＄2．84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105（1．97） | 111 （2．0\％） | 0 | 0 |
| 96雲 | \＄3．72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $79(1.4 \%)$ | 139 （2．5\％） | 0 | 0 |
| 100告 | \＄11． 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 （2．0\％） | 161 （2．98） | 2 （0．08） | 0 |
| motat |  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3，185 | 1 | 23 | 1，49．1 | 751 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0．2\％ | 58．3\％ | 0．0\％ | 0.48 | 27．3\％ | 13．7\％ | 0.0 \％ | 0.08 |
| cumunative |  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3，194 | 3，195 | 3，218 | 4，709 | $5.460{ }^{\circ}$ | 5，462 | 5.462 |
|  |  | $0.0 \%$ | 0.08 | $0.2 \%$ | 58．5\％ | 58．5\％ | 58．9\％ | 86．2\％ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | 100．0\％ |
| AVG．MO | O DIFE． | ． | － | \＄－50．5 | \＄－8．2 | \＄－0．0 | \＄0．0 | \＄1．4 | ．$\$ 2.9$ | \＄7．3 |  |

sill Comparison \#1 / Data From Yearly File (JAN 2021 - Dec 2011)


|  | \＄ | MOMTHLY \＄ | BELOK－ $20 \%$ | $-20--10 \%$ | $-10--5 \%$ | －5－－0．01\％ | －0．01－0\％ | $0-0.018$ | 0．01－54 | 5－108 | 10－－20\％ | ABOVE 20\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PCT | DITFERENCE | decrease | becrease | decrease | decrease | Decrease | increase | tncreash | Increase | Increass | increase |
|  | 4\％ | \＄－16．29 | 0 | 1 （0．0\％） | 122（0．208） | 2，188（3．8\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 8\％ | \＄－12．52 | 0 | 0 | 11（0．0\％） | 2，301（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 |
|  | 12\％ | \＄－10．54 | 0 | 0 | $2(0.0 \%)$ | 2，317（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 16\％ | \＄－9．15 | 0 | 0 | $2(0.08)$ | 2，307（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 20\％ | \＄－8．08 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 2，306（4．0\％） | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 24\％ | \＄－7．19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，321（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 28\％ | \＄－6．39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，322（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 32\％ | \＄－5．69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，313（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 36\％ | \＄－5．01 | 0 | 0 |  | 2，330（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $40 \%$ | \＄－4．38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，293（4．0㤟） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 448 | \＄－3．74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，293（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 48\％ | \＄－3．09 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 2，302（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 52\％ | \＄－2．39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，348（4．1者） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 56\％ | \＄－1．68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，274（3．98） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 60\％ | \＄－0．93 | 0 | － | 0 | 2，315（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\bigcirc$ | 64 \％ | \＄－0．14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，312（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 688 | \＄0．57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 （0．7\％） | 35 （0．1咅） | 96 （0．2咅） | 3，779（3．1\％） | $24\left(0.0{ }^{\text {営 }}\right.$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| $\cdots$ | 72\％ | \＄1．22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，949（3．4．4． | 337 （0．68） | 29 （0．1䨖） | 0 |
| $\sigma$ | $76{ }^{\circ}$ | \＄1．78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，639（2．88） | 562 （1．08） | $88(0.2 \%)$ | 0 |
|  | 80 告 | \＄2．33 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，445（2．5s ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ） | $657(1.18)$ | $209(0.48)$ | 0 |
|  | 84\％ | \＄2．89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，267（2．20） | 844（1．5\％） | $203(0.4$ 年） | 0 |
|  | 88\％ | \＄3．44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 881（2．5\％） | 1，223（2．18） | $216\left(0.4 \frac{1}{8}\right)$ | 0 |
|  | 924 | \＄4．16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 715 （2．2\％） | 1，385（2．4\％） | 213（0．48） | 0 |
|  | $96 \frac{6}{6}$ | \＄5．83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 842 （1．58） | 1，297（2．2\％） | 161（0．38） | 0 |
|  | 100\％ | \＄31．70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 （0．3容） | 1，905（3．3\％） | $203\left(0.4 \frac{2}{8}\right.$ ） | 0 |
|  | rotal |  | 0 | 1 | 138 | 37，234 | 35 | 36 | 10，710 | 8，235 | 1．322 | $\bigcirc$ |
|  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | 0．0\％ | 0．2\％ | 64．54 | 0.15 | 0．2\％ | 18.5 \％ | 14．3\％ | 2．3\％ | $0.0 \%$ |
|  | CUMULATIVE |  | 0 | 1 | 139 | 37，373 | 37，408 | 37，504 | 48,214 | 56．449 | 57．771 | \＄7．771 |
|  |  |  | 0．0\％ | $0.0 \%$ | 0．2\％ | 64．7\％ | 64．8\％ | 64．9\％ | 83．56 | 97．7\％ | 100．0\％ | 100．0\％ |
|  | Avg．Mo | 1 DIFF ． | ． | \＄－87．8 | \＄－33．8 | \＄－6．9 | \＄－0．0 | \＄0．0 | \＄2．0 | \＄4．3 | \％ 3.8 |  |

Eill Comparison \#1 / Data From Yearly File(Jan 2011 - Dec 2011) Res full service

correlatton of averace monthiy dowiar and percent differemces
Comparison Between Summer 2014 rates under current miles on 50\％ $8 Q$
AND Summer 2014 rates under proposed new rate design rales on $50 \% \mathrm{mg}$
FOR ANNUAL
Bill Comparison \＃i／Data From Yearly File（Jan 2011 －Dec 2011） RES EuII service

| \％M | MOMTHLY \＄ | ERLION－20\％ | －20－－10\％ | －10－－5\％ | －5－－0．01\％ | －0．01－0\％ | 0－0．01震 | 0．01－5\％ | 5－10\％ | 10－20\％ | ABOVE 20\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCT D | difference | decreasa | decrease | DECrEASE | Decrease | decrease | increase | increase | increase | tncrease | increasm |
| 4\％ | \＄－28．97 | 0 | $4(0.09)$ | $109(0.2$ 考） | 1，545（3．7\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $8 \%$ | \＄－20．98 | 0 | 0 | $51(0.18)$ | 1，705（3．9\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12\％ | \＄－17．24 | 0 | 0 | $24(0.18)$ | 1，736（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16\％ | \＄－14．92 | 0 | 0 | 10（0．0\％） | 1，740（4．0者） | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20\％ | \％－13．24 | 0 | 0 | $2(0.0 \%)$ | 1，760（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24\％ | \＄－11．91 | 0 | 0 | 3 （0．0\％） | 1．750（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28\％ | \＄－10．78 | 0 | 0 | $2(0.0 \%$ ） | 1，768（4．04） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 32．8 | \＄－9．80 | 0 | 0 | $1(0.08)$ | 1，753（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 35\％ | \＄－8．96 | 0 | 0 | $1(0.08)$ | 1，746（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40\％ | \＄－8．14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1， 767 （4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 44\％ | \＄－7．41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，751（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 48\％ | \＄－6．67 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 1，739（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 |
| 52\％ | \＄－5．95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，764（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 56\％ | \＄－5．23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，776（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 60\％ | \＄－4．50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，742（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 649 ${ }^{\frac{4}{8}}$ | \＄－3．70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，745（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 68\％ | \＄－2．79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，763（4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 72\％ | \＄－1．78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1， 749 （4．0\％） | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 76\％ | \＄－0．62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，759（4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 80\％ | \＄0．52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 857 （2．0\％） | $\left.23(0.0)^{3}\right)$ | $56(0.1 \%)$ | 82.1 （1．9\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 84\％ | \＄1．63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，714（3．98） | 47（0．1知） | 0 | 0 |
| $88{ }^{\text {\％}}$ | \＄2．61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，509（3．429） | $244(0.6 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 92\％ | \＄3．71 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 1．273（2．9\％） | 482 （1．18） | 0 | 0 |
| 96\％ | \＄5．53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1．129（2．6\％） | $631(1.49)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 100\％ | \＄36．44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 396 （0．9\％） | 1，353（3．18） | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  | 0 | 4 | 203 | 34，026 | 21 | 58 | 6，842 | 2，757 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
|  |  | 0．0\％ | $0.0 \%$ | 0.54 | 77．5\％ | $0.0 \%$ | 0．1\％ | 15．6部 | 6．3\％ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| comulative |  | 0 | 4 | 207 | 34，233 | 34，254 | 34，312 | 41．154 | 43,911 | 43，911 | 43，911 |
|  |  | 0.08 | 0．0\％ | 0.58 | $78.0 \%$ | 73.08 | 78．18 | 93．78 | 100．0\％ | $100.0 \%$ | 100.0 \％ |

Comparison Between Swner 2014 rates under current rules on $50 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
And Summer 2014 xates under proposed new rate design rules on 508 BQ FOR ANYUAL
Bill Comparison \#1 / Data From Yearly Fileluan zoli - Dec 2011
RES full service


# PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY APPENDIX C -2 

BILL COMPARISON (2): SB 695 -ADJUSTED RATES VERSUS SUMMER 2014 RATES US ING PROPOSED RATE DESIGN CONSTRUC T

CORFGLATIOM OF AVERAGE MONTHLY DOLLAR AND PERCEAT DIFFERENCES
Total Amual $3 i 11$ Sumary by Rate Schedules
comparison petween SB 695 -adjusted rates on $55 \%$ BQ
AND Sunmer 2014 rates under proposed new rate design rules on 50 BQ
Bill Comparison \#2 / Data From yearly Pile (JAN 2011 - Dec 2011)
LASTT
RATE
SCHEDULS
E1
E1L
E6
E6L
E7
B7L
E8
E8L
TOMAL
COUNT

$2,815,104$
$1,156,472$
5,462
379
57,771
7,757
43,911
8,692
$4,095,548$

ANNUAL TOTAL KNH
TOTAL AnNUAL
CURRENT BILLS

$\$ 3,642,585,256$
$\$ 768,502,719$
$\$ 11,947,190$
$\$ 681,679$
$\$ 117,516,104$
$\$ 8,887,092$
$\$ 149,616,234$
$\$ 13,650,115$
$\$ 4,713,386,388$

| CURRENT | TGTAL Ammbal | proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AvG Rate | PROPOSED BILLS | Avg Rate |
| 0.19928 | \$3,880,536,079 | 0.21230 |
| 0.10144 | \$837,332,506 | 0.11052 |
| 0.22751 | \$12,382,884 | 0.23581 |
| 0.11214 | \$735,083 | 0.12093 |
| 0.19383 | \$124,548,269 | 0.20542 |
| 0.10471 | \$9,689,748 | 0.11417 |
| 0.22147 | \$154,867,925 | 0.22924 |
| 0.09981 | \$14,921,799 | 0.10911 |
| 0.17192 | \$5,035,014,294 | 0.18365 |


| DIFFERENCE (PROPOSEDCORRBNTE) | (proposed CURRENTI/ CURREBTT |
| :---: | :---: |
| \$237,950,823 | 5.53\% |
| \$68,829,787 | 8.96\% |
| \$435,695 | 3.65\% |
| \$53,404 | 7.83\% |
| \$7,032,165 | 5.98\% |
| \$802,656 | 9.03\% |
| \$5,251,691 | 3.518 |
| \$1,271,684 | 9.32\% |
| \$321,627,905 | 6.82\% |

MAX Dtaference
$\$ 720$
$\$ 1,667$
$\$ 603$
$\$ 1,086$
$\$ 723$
$\$ 1,492$
$\$ 655$
$\$ 4,273$
$\$ 11,220$

MIN DTFFBRENCE
$\$-1.5,931$
\$-25
$\$-3,535$
$\$ 4$
380
$5-1,380$
50
$\$ 0$
$-3,592$
$\$ 0$
$\$-24,450$

CORRELATION OF AVGRAGE MONTHLY DOLLAR AND FERCENM DTFFERENCES
Comparison Between SB 695-adjusted rates on $55 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
AND sumner 2014 rates under proposed new rate design rules on $50 \% 0$

## FOR ANNUAL

Bill Comparison \#2 / Deta From Yearly Fileifan 2011 - Dec 2011
Res full service


CRRELATHON OF AVERAGE MONTHLY DOLIAR AND PERCENT DTFFERENCES
Comparison Between SB 695*adjusted rates on $55 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
AnD Summer 2014 rates under proposed new rate design rules on 50 Be FOR ANNUAL
bill Comparison \#2 / Data From Yeariy File (wan 2011 - Dec 2011
RES full service



RATE DATA ANALYSIS : RATEP DR5215.JCL(RFTI)


CORRELATION OF AVERAGE MONTHLY DOLLAR AND percent DIFFGRENCEs
Comparison Between SB 695 －adjusted rates on $55 \frac{8}{8} \mathrm{BQ}$
AND Summer 2014 rates under proposed new rate design rules on $50 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
FOR ANNUAL
Bill Comparison 42 ／Data From Yearly File（JAM 2011 －Dec 2011）
res full service

|  | \＄ | MONTHLI $\$$ | BELOT－ 20 \％ | $-20-10 \%$ | －10－－5\％ | －5－－0．01\％ | －0．01－0\％ | 0－0．01\％ | 0．01－5\％ | 5－10\％ | 10－20\％ | ABOVE 20\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PCT | difference | decramse | DEcriase | decrease | decrease | decrease | Increase | increase | increase | macrease | ImCrrast |
|  | 4\％ | \＄1．80 | 0 | $63(0.15$ ） | 117 （0．2\％） | 734 （1．3\％） | 5 （0．0\％） | $69(0.18)$ | 473 （0．8\％） | 713 （1．28） | $140(0.28)$ | 0 |
|  | 8\％ | \＄3．21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 576（1．0\％） | 966 （1．7\％） | 773 （1．38） | 1 （0．08） |
|  | 12\％ | \＄4．28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 834（1．4\％） | 537（0．9\％） | 932 （1．6\％） | $1(0.0 \mathrm{O})$ |
|  | $15 \%$ | \＄5．17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $939\left(1.6 \frac{3}{8}\right)$ | 412（0．7\％） | 947 （1．6\％） | $12(0,0$ 年） |
|  | $20{ }^{\text {妟 }}$ | \＄5．91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，136（2．08） | 395（0．7\％） | 770 （1．3\％） | $9(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | 24． | \＄6．51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，060（1．89） | 580（1．0\％） | 688（1．2\％） | 12 （0．0\％） |
|  | 28： | \＄6．93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $456(0.8 \%$ ） | 1，235（2．17） | 591 （1．0\％） | 15 （0．0\％） |
|  | 32\％ | \＄7．61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 800（1．4\％） | 493 （0．9\％） | 1，000（1．78） | 18 （0．0\％） |
|  | 36\％ | \＄8．32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1．168（2．0\％） | 259 （0．5\％） | 970（1．5\％） | 15 （0．0最） |
|  | 40\％ | \＄8．92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1． 288 （2．2\％） | 287（0．5\％） | 709 （1．28） | 18 （0．0\％） |
|  | 44\％ | \＄9．39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1，162（2．0\％） | $504(0.98)$ | $862(1.18)$ | $12(0.08)$ |
|  | 48\％ | \＄9．72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 524 （0．9\％） | 1．208（2．1\％） | 599 （1．0\％） | $7(0.08)$ |
|  | 52. | \＄9．96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $147(0.32)$ | 1，553（2．7\％） | 571 （1．0\％） | $8(0.08)$ |
|  | 56 | \＄10．22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | － | 0 | $11.5(0.2 \%)$ | 1，520（2．6\％） | 711 （1．28） | $7(0.08)$ |
|  | 60\％ | \＄10．53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 （0．3\％） | 1，266（2，2\％） | 810（1．49） | $12(0.08)$ |
| $\bigcirc$ | $64{ }^{\circ}$ | \＄11．12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 399 （0．7\％） | $637(1.18)$ | 1，188（2．1等） | $39(0.18)$ |
| 1 | 68\％ | \＄11．90 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 722 （1．2\％） | $561(1.0 \%)$ | 989（1．7\％） | $53(0.13)$ |
| N | 72\％ | \＄12．61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $383(0.78)$ | 1．147（2．0\％） | 733 （1．3\％） | $29(0.18$ ） |
| $\sigma$ | $76 \frac{8}{8}$ | \＄13．27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 （0．47） | 1，326（2．3\％） | 762 （2．3\％） | $25(0.08)$ |
|  | 80\％ | \＄14．43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $314(0.5 \%)$ | 916（1．6\％） | 1，045（1．88） | $47(0.15)$ |
|  | 848 | \＄15．67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 310 （0．5\％） | 833 （1．4\％） | 1，095（1．9\％） | $55(0.18)$ |
|  | 883 | \＄17．42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 557（1．0\％） | 683（2．2\％） | 2，036（1．8\％） | $37(0.18)$ |
|  | 92\％ | \＄18．79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49（0．18） | 1，326（2．3\％） | $920(1.68)$ | 19（0．08） |
|  | 96\％ | \＄20．74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $11(0.0 \%)$ | 1，246（2．0\％） | 1，118（1．98） | 29（0．18） |
|  | 100\％ | \＄60．28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 46（0．1\％） | 511 （0．9\％） | 1，417（2．58） | 334 （0．69） |
|  | TOTAL |  | 0 | 63 | 117 | 734 | 5 | 69 | 13，881 | 21，014 | 21，076 | 812 |
|  |  |  | 0.04 | 0．4\％ | 0．2\％ | 1．3\％ | 0.0 告 | 0.18 | 24．0\％ | 36．4\％ | 36．5\％ | 1.48 |
|  | comulative |  | 0 | 63 | 180 | 914 | 919 | 988 | 14．869 | 35．883 | 56，959 | $57+771$ |
|  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | 0.23 | $0.3 \%$ | 1．6\％ | 1.6 \％ | 1．740 | 25．7\％ | 62．1营 | 98．6\％ | 100．0\％ |
|  | AVG．MO DIFF． |  | － | \＄－29．3 | \＄－29．6 | \＄－7．2 | \＄－0．0 | \＄0．0 | \＄8． 1 | \＄11．0 | \＄11．5 | \＄22．2 |

CORRELATION OF AVERAGE MONTHI DOLLAR AND PERCENT DTFRERENCES
comparison Between SB 695－adjusted rates on $55 \%$ BQ
AND Sumer 2014 rates under proposed new rate design rules on $50 \% \mathrm{BC}$
FOR ANMUAL

Binl Comparison $\# 2 /$ Data From Yearly File（Jan 2011 －Dec 2011）
RES full service

|  | \＄M | MONTHLY \＄ | BELOW－20\％ | $-20-10 \frac{1}{2}$ | －10－－5\％ | －5－－0．01\％ | －0．01－08 | 0－0．01\％ | 0．01－5哂 | 5－10\％ | 10－20\％ | AEOVR 20\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PCT D | dtfrerence | decrease | decrmase | decrease | necramse | decrease | increase | tmermase | mferease | increase | ITACREASE |
|  | 4\％ | \＄1．36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $4(0.2 \%)$ | $23(0.3 \%)$ | 287（3．729） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 8咅 | \＄2．03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\left.5(0.1)^{2}\right)$ | 297 （3．8\％） | 7（0．1\％） | 0 |
|  | 12\％ | \＄2．70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3（0．0\％） | 291（3．8\％） | 20（0．3\％） | 0 |
|  | 16管 | \＄3．38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $5(0.18)$ | 256（3．3\％） | $45(0.6$ \％） | 0 |
|  | $20 \%$ | \＄4．00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $3(0.0 \%)$ | 224（2．9\％） | $84(1.18)$ | 0 |
|  | 24需 | \＄4．58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 （0．0\％） | 172 （2．28） | 134 （1．76） | 0 |
|  | 28\％ | \＄5．12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270（2．28） | 140（1．8\％） | 0 |
|  | $32 \%$ | \＄5．59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.98 （2．68） | 117（1．5\％） | 0 |
|  | 364 | \＄6．08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 （0．0易） | 155 （2．0\％） | 158 （2．08） | 0 |
|  | $40 \frac{8}{8}$ | \＄6．53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 （1．83） | 157 （2．2\％） | 0 |
|  | 44\％ | \＄6．95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140（1．88） | $170(2.23$ ） | 0 |
|  | 485 | \＄7．41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 （2．18） | 149（1．98） | 0 |
|  | 52\％ | \＄7．88 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 （2．4\％） | 113 （1．5\％） | 0 |
|  | 56号 | \＄8．39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181（2．38） | 132（1．78） | 0 |
|  | 60\％ | \＄8．90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 174 （2，28） | 136（1．8\％） | 0 |
|  | 645 | \＄9．46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 （2．4\％） | 128（1．78） | 0 |
| 1 | 68\％ | \＄10．00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 （2．6\％） | $210(1.48)$ | 0 |
| 1 | 72\％ | \＄10．63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192（2．5\％） | 214 （1．5\％） | 0 |
| $\checkmark$ | 765 | \＄12．46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2（0．08） | 205 （2．6\％） | 107（1．48） | 0 |
|  | 80\％ | \＄12．37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188 （2．4\％） | 220 （1．5\％） | 0 |
|  | 64\％ | \＄13．48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1（0．0\％） | 198 （2．68） | 110 （1．4\％） | 0 |
|  | 88\％ | \＄14．90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 （2．8．8） | 91（2．2\％） | 0 |
|  | 92\％ | \＄16．55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $227(2.98)$ | $83(1.18)$ | 0 |
|  | 96\％ | \＄19．76 | 0 － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 （2．75） | $94(2.2 \%)$ | 2 （0．0\％） |
|  | 100\％ | \＄1．24．37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268 （3．5\％） | 42（0．5\％） | 0 |
| total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 5，137 | 2，571 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 0.08 | $0.0 \%$ | 0.0 \％ | $0.0{ }^{\circ}$ | $0.0{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.18 | 0.68 | 66．2\％ | 33．14 | 0．0\％ |
| comolative |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 47 | 5，184 | 7.755 | 7.757 |
|  |  |  | 0.08 | 0.0 管 | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0{ }^{\text {\％}}$ | $0.1 \frac{1}{7}$ | $0.6 \%$ |  | $100.0 \%$ | 100.08 |
| AVG．MO DIFE． |  |  | ． | ． | ． | ． | ． | \＄0．0 | \＄2．0 | \＄8．7 | \＄8．7 | \＄17．4 |

Comparison Between SB 695-adjusted rates on $55 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
AND Summer 2014 rates under proposed new rate design rules on $50 \%$ BQ
POR AMNUAL

3 Bill Comparison \#2 / Data From Yearly FiletJan 2012 - Dec 2011 )
pes full service


Corrmlation of average monthly dolear and percent dtrekrences
Comparison Between 8 E 695－adjusted rates on 55 ： BQ
AND Surner 2014 rates under proposed new rate design mules on $50 \% 80$
FOR ANNOAL
Bill Comparison \＃2／Data From Yearly File（JAN 2011 －Dec 2011）
pes full service
LAST RATE SCHEDULE＝E8L

| \＄ | MONTHLY \＄ | BELOW－20\％ | －20－－10\％ | －10－－5 | －5－－0．02\％ | －0．01－08 | 0－0．02\％ | 0．01－5考 | 5－10\％ | 10－20\％ | ABOVE 20 \％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCT | DIfference | decrrase | decrease | DECREASE | decreasb | Decruase | merbase | Tncrease | TNCREASE | imcreask | increase |
| 4\％ | \％$\$ 2.81$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 （0．0\％） | 123 （1．4\％） | 222 （2．68） | 0 | 0 |
| 8 管 | －$\quad \$ 4.10$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $3(0.0 \%)$ | 340（3．9\％） | $4(0.08)$ | 0 |
| 12： | \％$\$ 5.14$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1（0．0\％） | 296（3．4\％） | 50（0．5\％） | 0 |
| 16\％ | \＄6．01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 （3．08） | $87(1.0 \%$ ） | 0 |
| $20{ }^{\text {易 }}$ | － 86.73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 （0．0\％） | 224（2．6．6） | 126（1．48） | 0 |
| 24\％ | \＄7．38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201（2．38） | 143（1．5\％） | $\bigcirc$ |
| 28\％ | －$\$ 7.98$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 （2．4\％） | 140（1．6\％） | 0 |
| 32等 | \＄8．55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 （2．59） | 235 （1．6\％） | 0 |
| 368 | \＄9．05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 （2．18） | 164（1．9\％） | 0 |
| 408 | \＄9．58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 （0．0\％） | 173 （2．0\％） | 169 （1．9\％） | 0 |
| 44\％ | \＄10． 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1(0.08)$ | 193 （2．29） | 157（1．8\％） | 0 |
| 48\％ | \＄10．68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 （2．28） | 149（1．7\％） | 0 |
| 52.8 | \＄11．23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 （0．08） | 1.94 （2．28） | 155 （1．8\％） | 0 |
| $56 \%$ | \＄$\$ 11.80$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1\left(0.0 \frac{8}{8}\right)$ | 218（2．5\％） | $128(1.5 \%)$ | 0 |
| 608 | \＄12．45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 （2．6\％） | 124 （1．48） | 0 |
| 64\％ | \＄13．15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192（2．2\％） | 155 （1．8\％） | 0 |
| 68\％ | \＄13．83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1(0.0 \%)$ | 167（1．98） | $179(2.18)$ | 0 |
| 72\％ | \＄14．60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 （1．8\％） | 192 （2．2\％） | 0 |
| 76\％ | \＄15．39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187（2．2\％） | 161（1．9\％） | 0 |
| 80\％ | \＄16．37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188 （2．22） | 160（1．8\％） | 0 |
| 84\％ | \＄17．56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214（2．50） | 133（1．5\％） | 0 |
| 88\％ | \＄19．03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 （2．6\％） | 120（1．4\％） | 0 |
| 92 \％ | \＄21．08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 （2．9\％） | 90（1．18） | 2 （0．0\％） |
| 96\％ | \＄25．14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256 （2．9\％） | $90(1.0 \%)$ | 0 |
| 100\％ | \＄356．07 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 324 （3．7\％） | $22(0.3 \%)$ | 0 |
| total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 133 | 5，510 | 3，043 | 2 |
|  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | 0.08 | －0．05 | 0.08 | 1．58 | 63.4 溇 | 35．0\％ | 0.04 |
| Cumulative |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 137 | 5，647 | 8，690 | 3，692 |
|  |  | 0.08 | 0.0 告 | 0．0\％ | $0.0 \%$ | 0.08 | 0．0\％ | 1．6\％ | 65．0\％ | 100．0\％ | 200.08 |
| Avg．Mo | O DIFF． |  |  |  |  |  | \＄0．0 | \＄1．5 | \＄12．6 | \＄12．1 | \＄19．5 |

## PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY APPENDIX C -3

BILL COMPARISON (3): SB 695 -ADJUSTED RATES VERSUS SUMMER 2014 RATES US ING CURRENT RATE DESIGN CONSTRUC T

CORRELATION OF AVERAGE MONTHLY DOLLAR AND gERCENT DXFFERENCES
Total Annual bill Sumary by Rate Schedules
Comparison Between $3 B$ 695-adjusted rates on $55 \frac{8}{3} \mathrm{BQ}$
AND Sumer 2014 rates under current rules on $50 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
Bill Comparison \#3 / Data From Yearly File (Jan 2011 - Dec 2011)

| LAST |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| date |  |  |
| schroulis | COUNT | ANMUAL TOTAL KMH |
| E1 | 2,815,104 | 18,278,276,127 |
| E14 | 1,256,472 | 7,576,011,970 |
| E5 | 5,462 | 52,512,188 |
| E6L | 379 | 6,078,576 |
| E7 | 57,771 | 606,295,672 |
| 575 | 7,757 | 84,873,446 |
| S\% | 43.911 | 675,567,529 |
| P84 | 8,692 | 135,763,391 |
| тоTAL | 4,095,548 | 27,416,378,899 |


| TOTAL ANNUAL | current | Total annual. | PROPOSED | DTPFERENCE (PROPOSED- | (PROPOSEDCURRENTM/ / |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CURRENT BILLS | AVg Rate | PROPOSED BILLS | Avg rate | CURrENT) |  | Max DIfference | M:N Diffrrence |
| \$3.642,585,256 | 0.19928 | \$3,899,789,361 | 0.21336 | \$257,204,104 | 7.06\% | \$22.557 | \$-363 |
| \$768,502,719 | 0.10144 | \$790,535,519 | 0.10435 | \$22,032,800 | 2.87\% | \$184 | \$-94 |
| \$11,947,190 | 0.22753 | \$12,645,724 | 0.24082 | \$698,534 | $5.85 \%$ | \$2,986 | \$-339 |
| \$681,579 | 0.11214 | \$691,6\%7 | 0.11379 | \$9,999 | 1.47\% | \$90 | \$-71 |
| \$117, 516,104 | 0.19383 | \$126.926,479 | 0.20935 | \$9,410,375 | 8.01\% | \$1,391 | \$-379 |
| \$8,887,092 | 0.10471 | \$9,142,777 | 0.10772 | \$255,685 | 2.88\% | \$187 | \$ -74 |
| \$149,616,234 | 0.22147 | \$159,040,025 | 0.23542 | \$9,423,790 | 6.30\% | \$3,254 | \$-351 |
| \$13,650,215 | 0.09981 | \$13,996,567 | 0.10234 | \$346.552 | 2.54\% | \$163 | \$-66 |
| \$4,713,386,388 | 0.17192 | \$5,012,768,228 | 0.18284 | \$299,381,840 | 6.35 \% | \$20,811 | \$-2.738 |

CORRELATHON OF AVERAGE MONTHTY DOLLAK AND PERCBNT DTFFERENCES
Comparison Between $5 B 695-a d j u s t e d$ rates on $35 \%$ RQ
and sumner 2014 rates under current rules on $50 \% \mathrm{BQ}$ FOR ANNuAL
Bill Comparison \#3 / Data From Yearly File (JNN 2011 - Dec 2011)
REs full service


CORRELATHOM OP AVEKAGE MONTHLY DOLLAR AND PERCENT DIFFERENCES
Comparison Between $S B 695$－adjusted rates on $55 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
And summer 2014 rates mader current rules on $50 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
FOR AMNUAL

Bill Comparison \＃3／Data from Yearly File（Jav 2011 －Dec 2011）
RES Enill service

|  | § M | MOMTHLY | BELOW－ $20 \%$ | $-20--10 \%$ | －10－－5\％ | －5－－0．01\％ | －0．07－0\％ | 0－0．01\％ | 0．01－5\％ | 5－10\％ | 10－20\％ | ABOVE 20\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PCT D | difference | DECREAEE | decrease | drcrease | Decremse | decrease | increase | INCREASE | micrease | increase | increask |
|  | $4{ }^{\circ}$ | \＄$\$ 0.00$ | 0 | 0 | $22(0.0 \%)$ | 236 （0．0\％） | $\left.27(0.0)^{5}\right)$ | 1．78，016（15．48） | 3，599（0．38） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 16\％ | \＄0．01 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | － | $28(0.0 \%)$ | 10，108（0．98） | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
|  | 20\％ | \＄0．06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39，501（3．48） | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | 24\％ | \＄0．16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47， 462 （4．1\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 285 | \＄0．29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46，944（4．17） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 32\％ | \＄0．47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45，289（3．98） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 36\％ | \＄0．69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45，097（3．9\％） | $7(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | 40\％ | \＄0．94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46，266（4，0\％） | $8(0.08)$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | 44 \％ | \＄1．20 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47，989（4，15） | 26 （0．0\％） | 0 | 0 |
|  | $48^{\circ}$ | \＄1．42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45，020（3，93） | $76(0.03)$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | 52. | \＄1．65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45，170（3．9\％） | 1， 892 （0．2\％） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 56\％ | \＄1．85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42，481（3．7\％） | 4，340（0．48） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 60\％ | \＄1．91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 58，066（5．0．9） | 2，920（0，3\％） | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
|  | 64 ${ }^{\text {厓 }}$ | \＄2．05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28，684（2．5知） | 1，552（0．12） | $2(0.0 \%)$ | 0 |
|  | 68\％ | \＄2．38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39，370（3．4\％） | 7，024（0．6\％） | 1 （0．08） | 0 |
| $\bigcirc$ | $72 \%$ | \＄2．67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 |  | 15，510（1．0者） | 0 | 0 |
|  | $76 \%$ | \＄2．81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.436 （3．48） | 11，088（1．08） | 0 | 0 |
| $\omega$ | 808 | \＄2．83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40.438 （3．58） | 5，129（0．4 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| $\omega$ | $84 \%$ | \＄3．15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35，100（3．0\％） | 7，403（0．6 0 ） | 1 （0．0\％） | 0 |
|  | 88妾 | \＄3．47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 39.456 （3．48） | 6，851（0．6\％） | 2（0．0者） | 0 |
|  | 92\％ | \＄3．64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64，436（5．6\％） | 4．009（0．3咅） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 96\％ | \＄3．87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | c | 21．851（1．98） | 2，540（0．2\％） | 1（0．0\％） | 0 |
|  | 100\％ | \＄15．18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32，882（2．88） | 12，674（1．18） | 269 （0．0者） | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 0 | 0 | 22 | 236 | 27 | 178，044 | 898.818 | 79．049 | 276 | $\bigcirc$ |
|  |  |  | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0．0\％ | $0.0 \%$ | 0.0 告 | $15.4 \%$ | 77.78 | 6．8\％ | 0.08 | 0.0 \％ |
|  | cumulative |  | 0 | 0 | 22 | 258 | 285 | 178．329 | 1077147 | 1156196 | 1156472 | 1556472 |
|  |  |  | $0.0{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.08 | $0.0 \%$ | 0．0\％ | $0.0 \%$ | 15．4． | 93.1 咅 | 100．0\％ | 100.08 | 100．0\％ |
|  | AVG．MO | O DIFF． | ． | ． | \＄－6．2 | \＄－1．3 | \＄－0．0 | \＄0．0 | \＄1．8 | \＄3．1． | \＄10．7 |  |

CORRELATION OF AVERAGE MONTHLY DOLLAR AND PERCENT DIFFERENCES
Comparison Between 58 695-adjusted rates on $55 \% \mathrm{~B} 0$
ano Summer 2014 rates under current rules on $50 \% \mathrm{BO}$
FOR ANNUAL
Bill Comparison \#3 / Data From Xearly File(Jan 2011 - Dec 2011) RES full service


Comparison Between 38695 －adjusted rates on $55 \%$ BO
AND Sumer 2014 rates under current rules on $50 \% 30$
Eill Comparison \＃3／Data From Yearly Filef（JAN 2011 －Dec 2011 kesf full service

|  | \＄ | MONThty | EELOW－20\％ | －20－－10\％ | －10－－5\％ | －5－－0．01\％ | －0．01－0员 | $0-0.01 \%$ | 0．01－5\％ | 5－10年 | 10－20\％ | ABOVE 20\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PCT | differemee | decraase | decrease | decrease | Decrease | decrease | increase | INCREASE | incrmase | Increase | increase |
|  | 4\％ | \＄$\$ 0.00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1(0.37)$ | 1 （0．3\％） | $22(5.8 \%)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 8 䂞 | \＄$\$ 0.02$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 （1．6\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 12\％ | \％$\$ 0.21$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 （4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 16\％ | \＄$\$ 0.50$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 （4．2\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 20\％ | \＄$\$ 0.78$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 （4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 24\％ | －\＄1．00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 （4．58） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 28\％ | \＄3．32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 13 （3．48） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 32\％ | \＄1．57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － | $17(4.58)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 36\％ | \＄1．69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 14 （3．78） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 40\％ | \＄1．74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 （4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 44\％ | \＄1．81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 （4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $48 \%$ | \＄2．20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 （4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 52\％ | \＄2．43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 （4．0\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $56 \%$ | \＄2．51 | 0 | o | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16（4．2\％） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 60\％ | \＄2．60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 （4．08） | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
| Q | 64暏 | \＄2．75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $23(3.48)$ | 2 （0．5\％） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 68管 | \＄2．96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 2.5 （4．08） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 728 | \＄3．24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 （4．08） | $2(0.58)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | $76 \%$ | \＄$\$ 3.41$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $10(2.6 \%)$ | 3（0．8\％） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 80\％ | －$\$ 3.60$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $27(4.58)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $84{ }^{\text {\％}}$ | \＄3．71． | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13（3．4\％） | 1（0．3\％） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 88\％ | \＄3．88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 14（3．7\％） | 1（0．3＊） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 92\％ | \＄4．33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 （4．05） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $96 \%$ | \＄4．86 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 （3．7\％） | $2(0.5 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | 100\％ | \＄7．41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 （3．2\％） | $2(0.5 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |
| tomate |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 342 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | 0．0\％ | $0.3{ }^{\text {\％}}$ | $0.3 \%$ | 5.89 | $90.2{ }^{\text {2 }}$ | $3.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| cumolative |  |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 366 | 379 | 379 | 379 |
|  |  |  | 0.08 | $0.0 \%$ | 0.0 娄 | 0．3\％ | $0.5 \%$ | 6.3 告 | 96.64 | 100．0\％ | 100．0\％ | 100．0 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Ave．MO DTFF． |  |  | ． | － | ． | \＄－5．9 | \＄－0．0 | \＄0．0 | \＄2．4 | \＄3．3 | － |  |

Comparison Between sB 695－adjusted rates on $55 \%$ BQ
AND Sumer 2014 rates under current rules on $50 \%$ BQ
For annual
Bi11 Comparison \＃3／Data From Yearly File（onn 2011－Dec 2011
RES full service

|  | \＄ | MONTHLY | BELOW－ 20 名 | $-20-10^{\circ}$ | $-10-5 \%$ | －5－－0．010 | －0．01－0\％ | 0－0．01\％ | 0．01－5\％ | 5－10\％ | 10－20\％ | ABOVE $20{ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PCT | DIffrrence | decrease | decrbase | DECREASE | decrease | DECREASE | imcrease | increase | facrease | incerase | Tacrease |
|  | 4\％ | \＄0．01 | 1 10．0者） | 35 （0．1娄） | 131（0．28） | $38(0.18)$ | 0 | 2，097（3．68） | $85(0.28$ \％ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 8\％ | \＄$\$ 0.75$ | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2，244（3．98） | 5（0．0 0 ） | 0 | 0 |
|  | 12\％ | ．$\$ 2.66$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3， 584 （2．7\％） | 630（1．24） | $43(0.18)$ | 0 |
|  | 16\％ | \＄4．61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 384 （0．73） | 1．474（2．65） | 441 （0．8\％） | 0 |
|  | 20\％ | \＄6．22 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191（0．3\％） | 1．247（2．2\％） | 881（1．5\％） | $2(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | 24\％ | \＄7．58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 （0．2\％） | $901(1.6 \%)$ | 1，298（2．28） | 3 （0．08） |
|  | 28\％ | \＄8．91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | $65(0.15$ ） | 850（1．5\％） | 1，398（2．48） | $5(0.05)$ |
|  | 32\％ | 89.99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31（0．2\％） | 988（1．76） | 1，282（2．2\％） | 6（0．0\％） |
|  | 36\％ | \＄10．73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 （0．0告） | 1．116（1．93） | 1，165（2．0\％） | $7(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | 40\％ | \％11．45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | $25(0.0 \%)$ | 1，142（2．05） | 1，132（2．0\％） | $5(0.08)$ |
|  | 44\％ | \＄12．23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $31(0.7$ \％） | 1，059（1．8\％） | 1．216（2．1\％） | $5(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | 48\％ | \＄13．11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $93(0.2 \%)$ | 915 （1．58） | 1，308（2．3\％） | 15（0．0\％） |
|  | 52 离 | \＄14．04 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $239\left(0.4 \frac{1}{5}\right.$ ） | 678 （1．2\％） | 1，368（2．4왕 | $11(0.05)$ |
|  | 56. | \＄14．93 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177（0．3\％） | 922（1．6\％） | 1，234（2．1\％） | $3(0.08)$ |
|  | 60\％ | \＄45．58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $81(0.18)$ | 1．530（2．5\％） | 678（1．20） | $3(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | 64\％ | \＄16．20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $45\left(0.1 \frac{1}{8}\right)$ | 1，845（3．28） | 419（0．7香） | $4(0.0 \%)$ |
| 1 | 68\％ | \＄16．88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $52(0.1 \%)$ | 1，747（3．0\％） | 494 （0．9\％） | $15(0.0 \%)$ |
| $\omega$ | $72 \%$ | \＄27．75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $37(0.15)$ | 2，589（2．8\％） | $582(1.2 \%)$ | $9(0.0 \%$ ） |
| $\sigma$ | 76 \％ | \＄18．78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $67(0.18)$ | 1，501（2．6\％） | 728 （1．3\％） | $13(0.08)$ |
|  | 80 娄 | \＄20．06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $339(0.6 \%)$ | 1，243（2．28） | 706（1．2咅） | $14(0.08)$ |
|  | 84\％ | \＄21．55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $352(0.6 \%)$ | 1．193（2．12） | 741 （1．32） | $18(0.08)$ |
|  | 88告 | \＄23．48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 （0．4\％） | 1，155（2．0\％） | 926（1．69） | 14 （0．0\％） |
|  | 929 | \＄26．31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 （0．4\％） | 1，165（2．04） | 891 （2．5\％） | 40（0．1\％） |
|  | 96\％ | \＄30．03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1．71（0．3年） | 1，127（2．08） | 988（1．7\％） | 25 （0．0 \％） |
|  | $100 \%$ | 117.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 344 （0．6\％） | 1，078（1．98） | 692（1．2\％） | 193 （0．3\％） |
|  | totas |  | 2 | 35 | 131 | 38 | 0 | 2.097 | 7，198 | 27，150 | 20，711 | 410 |
|  |  |  | $0.0 \%$ | 0．1\％ | 0．2\％ | 0．1\％ | $0.0 \%$ | 3．6咅 | 12.54 | 47．0\％ | 35．9\％ | 0．7\％ |
|  | ctmulative |  | 1 | 36 | 167 | 205 | 205 | 2，302 | 9.500 | 36，650 | 57．361 | 57，771 |
|  |  |  | 0．0\％ | 0.18 | 0．3\％ | 0．4\％ | 0.44 | $4.0 \%$ | 16．4\％ |  | 99．3\％ | 100．0\％ |

Comparison Between SE 695 －adjusted rates on $55^{\circ} \mathrm{BQ}$
and summer 2014 rates under current rules on $50 \%$ BO

## FOR ANNUAL

Bill Comparison \＃3／Data From Yearly File（JaN 2011 －Dec 2011） Res full service

| \＄M | MOMTHEY \＄ | BETION－20\％ | －20－－10知 | －10－－55 | －5－－0．018 | $-0.01-0 \%$ | 0－0．01 需 | $0.01-5 \frac{4}{4}$ | 5－10\％ | 10－20\％ | APOVE 20\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCT D | differmice | decrease | decrease | decrease | DECREASE | decrease | incrense | increase | thCrsase | macrease | mincrease |
| 4 $\frac{2}{8}$ | \＄0．00 | 0 | 0 | $1(0.0 \%)$ | 14 （0．2\％） | 0 | 447（5．88） | 7 （0．2年） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $8{ }^{\text {8 }}$ | \＄0．09 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 （0．0\％） | $171\left(2.2 \frac{8}{8}\right)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12\％ | \＄0．32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291（3．38） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16\％ | \＄0．67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317（4．13 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 咅 | \＄1．03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 303 （3．93） | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24\％ | \＄1．42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － | 310 （4．02） | $2(0.08)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 28\％ | \＄1．73 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 306 （3．9\％） | $22(0.35$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| 32 ${ }^{\text {号 }}$ | \＄1．83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | － | 294 （3．38） | $5(0.13)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 36\％ | \＄1．94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305 （3．98） | $11(0.18$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| $40 \%$ | \＄2．24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270（3．58） | $29(0.48)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 44\％ | \＄2．53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 （3．2\％） | $56\left(0.7{ }^{\circ}\right.$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| $48 \%$ | \＄2．69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 （3．58） | $52(0.78)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 52\％ | \＄2．78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 （3．50） | $45(0.6 \%)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 56\％ | \＄2．87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255 （3．3年） | $45(0.50$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| 60\％ | \＄3．03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 （3．5\％） | $28(0.45$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| 64\％ | \＄3．31 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262（3．49） | $58\left(0.7 \frac{8}{5}\right)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 68\％ | \＄3．55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 （3．48） | $38\left(0.5 \frac{2}{9}\right)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 72\％ | \＄3．73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 292 （3．8\％） | $38(0.58)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 76\％ | \＄3．87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 （3．5吾） | $36(0.58$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| $80{ }^{5}$ | \＄4．06 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 （3．48） | $30(0.48$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| 84\％ | \＄4．55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227（2．98） | $87(2.18)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 88\％ | \＄4．87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $238(3.15)$ | $72(0.98$ ） | 0 | 0 |
| 92\％ | \＄5．20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 （3．5雱） | $37\left(0.5 \frac{1}{8}\right)$ | 0 | 0 |
| 95\％ | \＄5．45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 （2．7\％） | $92\left(1.2{ }^{\text {\％}}\right.$ ） | 1 （0．0\％） | 0 |
| 100\％ | \＄15．61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 （2．18） | 113 （1．5\％） | $35(0.58)$ | 0 |
| Tomal |  | 0 | 0 | $\pm$ | 14 | 0 | 448 | 6，362 | 896 | 36 | 0 |
|  |  | 0.08 | 0．0\％ | $0.0 \%$ | 0.2 咢 | 0．0\％ | 5.8 \％ | 82．0\％ | 11.68 | 0．5知 | 0．0： |
| cumulative |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 463 | 6，825 | 7.721 | 7.757 | 7,757 |
|  |  | 0．0\％ | 0．0\％ | 0．0\％ | 0.2 \％ | 0.28 | $6.0 \%$ | 88．0\％ | 99．54 | 100．0\％ | 100．0\％ |
| Avg ．mo | DIfF． | ． | － | \＄－4．3 | \＄－4．9 | ． | \＄0．0 | \＄2．7 | \＄4．2 | \＄10．3 |  |

Comparison Between $5 B 695$-adjusted rates on $55 \% \mathrm{BQ}$
AND Summer 2014 rates under current rules on 50\% BQ For annual
Bill Comparison \#3 / Data From Yearly Filefonn 2011 - Dec 2011)
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# PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY APPENDIX D 

## STATEMENTS OF QUALIF ICATIONS

## PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS OF DENNIS M. KEANE

[^14]manager position in that department. From July 2008 through February 2009, I worked as a principal in the Market Design and Analysis Department, responsible for estimating avoided costs and evaluating demand response cost-effectiveness. In March 2009, I took the position of manager of electric rates in the Analysis and Rates Department. I was promoted to my current, senior manager position in April 2011.

I have previously appeared before the Commission, sponsoring testimony on electric rate design, revenue forecasting, flexible rate options, customer retention and economic development, the applicability of non-bypassable charges to direct access and departing load customers, and the cost-effectiveness of PG\&E's demand response programs.
Q 4 What is the purpose of your testimony?
A 4 I am sponsoring the following testimony and workpapers in PG\&E's Summer 2014 Residential Electric Rate Reform Proposal-Revised Prepared Testimony:

- Chapter 1, "Amended Summer 2014 Rate Reform Policy."
- Chapter 2, "Amended Summer 2014 Residential Rate Design."
- Section A, "Introduction."
- Section B, "Summer 2014 Rate Design."
- Section C, "Standard Non-CARE Rates."
- Section F, "Rate Changes Between Cases."

Q 5
Does this conclude your statement of qualifications?
A 5 Yes, it does.

## PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS OF PHILIP J. QUADRINI

 2011 and 2014 GRC Phase II proceedings.

Q 4 What is the purpose of your testimony?
A 4 I am sponsoring the following testimony and workpapers in PG\&E's Summer 2014 Residential Electric Rate Reform Proposal-Revised Prepared Testimony:

- Chapter 2, "Amended Summer 2014 Residential Rate Design."
- Section D, "Standard CARE Rates."
- Section E, "Optional Schedules Rate Design."
- Appendix A, "Electric Baseline Quantities."

Q 5 Does this conclude your statement of qualifications?
A 5 Yes, it does.


[^0]:    1 See January 8, 2014 Prehearing Conference (PHC) Transcript (Tr.), pp. 64-65. On January 24, 2014, President Peevey and Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) McKinney issued a second amended scoping memo and ruling ("Amended Scoping Memo") providing guidance on amended testimony to be served by the utilities. The Amended Scoping Memo also requested that the utilities provide rate and bill impact comparisons in common templates, as requested by Energy Division and other parties. PG\&E will be providing the common templates subsequently in a separate exhibit to be served on the parties. The Amended Scoping Memo formalized guidance provided at the January 8, 2014, prehearing conference in this proceeding. For ease of exposition, this testimony may in some places refer to PG\&E's amended proposal as simply its "summer 2014 rate reform proposal," since it supplants in its entirety PG\&E's November 22, 2013 proposal.
    2 See proposed OIR Phase 2 schedule provided by ALJ McKinney to the parties at the January 8, 2014 PHC; see also PHC Transcript at p. 73, lines 21-27, p. 74 lines 2-4, p. 86, lines 4-5 and p. 91, lines 13-16.

[^1]:    14 See Bonbright, Danielson, and Kanerschen, Principles of Public Utility Rates, specifically, Chapter 5, entitled "Cost of Service as a Basic Standard of Reasonableness."

[^2]:    17 After workshops and comments by parties, the ALJ's March 19, 2013 Ruling Requesting Residential Rate Design Proposal listed ten rate design principles (see Attachment $A$ to that Ruling, $\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{A}-1$ ).

[^3]:    1 Throughout this testimony, PG\&E uses "upper tiers" to refer to its current Tier 3 and 4 (i.e., consumption in excess of 130 percent of baseline), and uses "lower tiers" to refer to Tier 1 and 2 usage (i.e., usage up to 130 percent of baseline).
    2 The CARE discount is calculated by taking the difference between (a) CARE sales by tier priced at non-CARE rates and (b) CARE sales by tier priced at CARE rates, then dividing this difference by (b) to yield a CARE percent discount from non-CARE rates. When PG\&E is authorized in the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) to implement GHG costs and revenue returns into rates sometime during 2014, this formula will be modified to account for Climate Dividend revenue returns in both the numerator and denominator. The Climate Dividend was authorized in the GHG OIR by the CPUC in Decision 12-12-033. PG\&E will also take into account any Commission-adopted changes in the ratemaking for GHG costs and revenue returns, including the Commission staff's proposal that the Commission consider removing the use of GHG allowance revenues to volumetrically offset cap-and-trade related compliance costs in residential electric rates. (See Staff Proposal for Residential Rate Reform in Compliance with R.12-06-013 and Assembly Bill 327, CPUC Energy Division, January 3, 2014, p. 71.) Because the GHG Climate Dividend is returned to customers on a twice-a-year, non-volumetric, lump-sum basis, it does not directly impact the tiered rate levels under PG\&E's rate design proposal. However, it does affect the annualized average monthly bills of residential electricity customers, as well as the volatility of those bills, and therefore affects the bill impacts of PG\&E's proposal on both non-CARE and CARE customers.

[^4]:    3 See schedule provided at January 8, 2014 Prehearing Conference by ALJ McKinney, and see Prehearing Conference Tr. pages 70-74 and pages 86 and 91 , indicating that ALJ McKinney and the parties currently anticipate that the utilities' longer-term residential rate reform proposals, in OIR Phase 1, should be filed in late February, specifically on February 28, 2014.
    4 And further discussed in PG\&E's comments on parties' rate proposals filed on July 12 and 26, 2013.

[^5]:    5
    Under the CPUC's Rate Case Plan as well as its decision in Decision 02-04-026 in the Baseline OIR, it has long been CPUC practice that the most recent four years of historical usage data by climate zone, used to set baseline quantities, are included as part of the utilities' showings in General Rate Case (GRC) Phase II proceedings. Here, however, to avoid overlap, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) in PG\&E's 2014 GRC Phase II proceeding (A.13-04-012), ALJ Long, suspended the schedule for consideration of most residential rate issues (all but the electric master-metered discounts and the natural gas baseline quantities) until the CPUC could provide guidance (presumably in this OIR proceeding) as to the venue and timing for further rate reform proposals relating to the post-summer 2014 period. Thus, PG\&E is presenting its proposal for updated electric baseline quantities in this proceeding. PG\&E's baseline quantity update proposal here is based on its proposal currently suspended in PG\&E's 2014 GRC Phase II proceeding.

[^6]:    7 Advice Letter 4314-E was approved by the Commission's Energy Division on
    December 31, 2013, too late for the rate changes to be implemented in PG\&E's January 1,2014 rates. PG\&E anticipates implementing these rate changes on March 1, 2014. The SB 695-adjusted starting point rates thus represent what current rates would be if there had been sufficient time to implement them on January 1, 2014.
    8 Amended Scoping Memo, January 24, 2014, pp. 2-3.
    9 Again, this represents the proposed total revenue requirement level. What the CPUC and the FERC adopt in these proceedings may vary from the levels proposed by PG\&E.

[^7]:    15 This is similar to how the Commission evaluates rate proposals in PG\&E's GRC Phase II proceedings-by comparing the bill impacts from two sets of rates which collect the identical revenue requirement.

[^8]:    21 SB 695 in 2009 and AB 327 in 2013.
    22 PG\&E's proposed approach also makes progress toward reducing the CARE discount percentage towards the mandated 30 to 35 percent range.

[^9]:    36 Per Global Insight's Q1 2013 US Economy Forecast, inflation rates are assumed to be at 1.44 percent for 2013 and 1.72 percent for 2014 . For comparison purposes, the U.S. CPI rose 1.46 percent in 2013.

    37 Moreover, this is before accounting for the effects of the Climate Dividend which reduces the nominal average rate under PG\&E's summer 2014 proposal from 10.9 to 10.0 cents per kWh, a mere 0.1 cents per kWh higher than the 2013 nominal average rate.

[^10]:    1 The baseline quantities adopted by Decision 11-05-047 were based on recorded data from November 2005 through October 2009.

[^11]:    2 Except for all-electric baseline quantities in the winter season, which PG\&E proposed to set at 60 percent of average usage, per Public Utilities Code (Pub. Util. Code) Section 739(a)(1).

    3 PG\&E has already made a fully litigated showing supporting a reduction to a 50 baseline in its 2012 RDW (A.12-02-020).

    4 This proposed winter all-electric baseline quantities would be 60 percent vs. the current 65 percent, consistent with what PG\&E requested in its 2012 RDW application.

[^12]:    5 Baseline quantities in 1993 remained in effect until they were adjusted in 2001.
    However, this adjustment did not follow the standard Baseline Quantity procedure since new baseline quantities could not be lower than their 2001 levels.

[^13]:    6 The CPUC now requires CARE customers exceeding 600 percent of baseline in a single month to either significantly lower their consumption or be removed from the CARE program. The CPUC also requires that CARE customers exceeding 400 percent of baseline in a single month must participate in PG\&E's Energy Savings Assistance Program to remain in the CARE program. (See D.12-08-044, pp. 219-221.)

[^14]:    Q 1 Please state your name and business address.
    A 1 My name is Dennis M. Keane, and my business address is Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, California.
    Q 2 Briefly describe your responsibilities at Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG\&E).
    A 2 I am a senior manager in the Analysis and Rates Department, responsible for preparing and managing the preparation of retail electric rate design proposals for presentation before the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission).
    Q 3 Please summarize your educational and professional background.
    A 3 I received a bachelor of arts degree in economics (with honors) in 1974 from the University of California at Berkeley, and a Ph.D. degree in economics in 1980 from the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

    From 1978-1980, I taught in the Economics Department at the University of Southern California. In 1980, I joined PG\&E as a load research analyst, responsible for preparing PG\&E's class load research reports and designing samples for load profile metering projects. In 1982, I was promoted to coordinator of load research projects, where I managed a number of large-scale load profile metering projects. In 1984, I was promoted to supervisor of load management analysis and operations, responsible for scheduling experimental operations of PG\&E's dispatchable load management programs, as well as estimating their load impacts. In 1988, I became the supervisor of commercial/industrial electric rate design. In 1991, I accepted a position in the Market Planning and Research Department, where I managed a number of projects designed to evaluate the effectiveness and economics of distributed generation and targeted demand-side management programs designed to alleviate peaking problems on the local distribution system. I left PG\&E in 1993 for a position at the consulting firm Freeman, Sullivan \& Company, where I directed the firm's electric utility practice. I returned to PG\&E in 1996 as a senior analyst in the Service Analysis Department, and, in 2000, was promoted to a

