BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2014.

(U 39 M)

Application 12-11-009 (Filed November 15, 2012)

And Related Matter.

Investigation 13-03-007

REPLY COMMENTS OF MARIN CLEAN ENERGY ON THE PROPOSED DECISION FOR THE GENERAL RATE CASE APPLICATION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Shalini Swaroop Regulatory Counsel MARIN CLEAN ENERGY 781 Lincoln Avenue, Suite 320 San Rafael, CA 94901 Telephone: (415) 464-6040 Facsimile: (415) 459-8095

E-Mail: sswaroop@mceCleanEnergy.org

July 14, 2014

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2014.

Application 12-11-009 (Filed November 15, 2012)

(U 39 M)

Investigation 13-03-007

REPLY COMMENTS OF MARIN CLEAN ENERGY ON THE PROPOSED DECISION FOR THE GENERAL RATE CASE APPLICATION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

I. INTRODUCTION

And Related Matter.

In accordance with Rule 14.3 (d) of the California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure ("Rules"), Marin Clean Energy ¹ ("MCE") respectfully submits reply comments on the Proposed Decision Authorizing Pacific Gas & Electric Company's ("PG&E's") General Rate Case Revenue Requirement for 2014 -2016 ("PD") issued by Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") Thomas R. Pulsifer on June 18, 2014. MCE supports the arguments of both the Merced and Modesto Irrigation Districts ("MMID") and the City and County of San Francisco ("CCSF") regarding the Commission's error in approving \$1.5 million in PG&E customer retention funds. PG&E Has Not proved that its proposed customer retention activities are just and reasonable.

¹ In December 2013, the Marin Energy Authority's Board of Directors changed the name of the entity to "Marin Clean Energy" or "MCE."

II. PG&E HAS NOT PROVED THAT ITS PROPOSED CUSTOMER RETENTION ACTIVITIES ARE JUST AND REASONABLE

MCE agrees with both MMID and CCSF² that PG&E has not proved by a preponderance of evidence that its customer retention costs a re just and reasonable. As CCSF notes, "PG&E does not ev en track its customer retention costs (by activity, location, requesting entity, or otherwise)." Given that PG&E cannot disclose with specificity what activities these funds will provide beyond vague descriptions, PG&E has not met its burden of proof and the request should be denied.

CCSF is correct that given this lack of evidence as to what these funds will be used for, the Commission should turn to the evidence of how PG&E attempts to discourage a competitive energy market.⁴ While the present request does not apply in the case of Communi ty Choice Aggregators, the following PG&E activities have occurred in that regard:

- \$46 million in 2010 to fund the failed Proposition 16 to limit Community Choice
 Aggregation ("CCA") in California; and
- An undetermined amount of money in order to support AB 2145 (Bradford)
 during the current 2013-2014 legislative session in order to limit CCA throughout
 California.

As indicated by MMID, PG&E 's customer retention efforts entail "attempts to discourage, oppose, block, and impede local efforts to establish municipal utility projects." ⁵ MCE respectfully requests that PG&E's request for \$1.5 million in customer retention funds be denied.

² Comments of MMID at 5, Comments of CCSF at 4.

³ Comments of CCSF at 4, Comments of MMID at 6.

⁴ Comments of CCSF at 5.

⁵ Comments of MMID at 6.

III. CONCLUSION

MCE thanks Commissioner Florio and ALJ Pulsifer for their consideration of the issues herein.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Shalini Swaroop

Shalini Swaroop Regulatory Counsel MARIN CLEAN ENERGY 781 Lincoln Avenue, Suite320 San Rafael, CA 94901 Telephone: (415) 464-6040

Facsimile: (415) 459-8095

E-Mail: sswaroop@mceCleanEnergy.org

July 14, 2014