

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison  
Company (U 338-E) For Approval Of Its Forecast  
2017 ERRR Proceeding Revenue Requirement.

---

Application No. 16-05-001  
(Filed May 1, 2016)

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S (U 338-E)**  
**NOTICE OF *EX PARTE* COMMUNICATION**

FADIA R. KHOURY  
RUSSELL A. ARCHER

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-2865  
Facsimile: (626) 302-3990  
E-mail: [Russell.Archer@sce.com](mailto:Russell.Archer@sce.com)

Dated: **February 28, 2017**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison  
Company (U 338-E) For Approval Of Its Forecast  
2017 ERRRA Proceeding Revenue Requirement.

---

Application No. 16-05-001  
(Filed May 1, 2016)

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S (U 338-E)  
NOTICE OF *EX PARTE* COMMUNICATION**

Pursuant to Rule 8.4 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission), Southern California Edison Company (SCE) hereby gives notice of the following notice of *ex parte* communication. The communication occurred on Thursday, February 23, 2017, at 3:30 p.m. at the offices of the Commission. The communication was oral and lasted approximately 40 minutes. The attached written materials were distributed during the meeting.

SCE, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) (collectively, Joint Utilities) initiated the communication with Nick Chaset, Advisor to Commissioner Michael Picker. Attending the meeting for SCE were Colin Cushnie, Vice President, Energy Procurement and Management, and Laura Genao, Managing Director, Regulatory Affairs. Attending the meeting for PG&E were Fong Wan, Senior Vice President, Energy Policy and Procurement, and Meredith Allen, Senior Director, Regulatory Affairs. Attending the meeting for SDG&E were Kendall Helm, Director of Origination and Brian Prusnek, Director of Regulatory Affairs.

The Joint Utilities described the increasing number of communities that are considering Community Choice Aggregation (CCA). The Joint Utilities explained that the timeframe from CCA exploration to implementation is shrinking and communities like the City of San Diego and Los Angeles County represent a significant share of their respective investor-owned utilities' (IOUs) total load. In aggregate, potential load departure from the Joint Utilities' bundled service procurement could be up to approximately 80 percent of total retail load. State law requires that remaining IOU bundled service retail customers do not experience any cost increases as a result of departing load (including to CCAs). This is known as the "indifference requirement," and the Commission has established the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment (PCIA) and Cost Allocation Mechanism (CAM) to ensure that departing load customers pay for their pro rata portions of the Joint Utilities' legacy and reliability-related procurement portfolios, respectively. The Joint Utilities explained, however, that the PCIA is flawed and does not prevent cost shifting to remaining bundled service customers. The current administratively-set benchmarks for renewable energy and capacity "value" used to calculate PCIA rates significantly overstate the estimated market value of the IOUs' generation portfolios. Current market revenues are not sufficient to cover the costs of the generation resources in the IOUs' portfolios. Accordingly, because current PCIA revenues are insufficient to cover departing load's pro rata share of above-market costs of the IOUs' generation portfolios procured on behalf of all of their customers, the IOUs' remaining bundled service customers pay for the shortfall. To remedy this situation, the Joint Utilities propose moving to a portfolio allocation method that allocates the pro rata portion of the actual net costs and benefits of their respective generation portfolios to both bundled service and departing load customers. This has the additional benefit of facilitating a retrospective true-up to reflect actual costs and benefits, and would eliminate the reliance on administratively-set benchmarks. It would also be more effective than the PCIA at meeting the statutory indifference requirement, which is achieved only when all customers pay their pro rata share of above-market legacy utility procurement costs. The Joint Utilities discussed this Portfolio Allocation Method, along with other potential options, during the last two PCIA

Working Group meetings, and are considering proposing it to the Commission in a joint application.

Respectfully submitted,

FADIA R. KHOURY  
RUSSELL A. ARCHER

*/s/ Russell A. Archer*

---

By: Russell A. Archer

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-2865  
Facsimile: (626) 302-3990  
E-mail: Russell.Archer@sce.com

February 28, 2017

**ATTACHMENT**

**Update on Customer Choice in California and Portfolio Allocation Proposal**

# Update on Customer Choice in California and Portfolio Allocation Proposal

February 2017

*Joint presentation of PG&E, SCE, SDG&E*

# Executive Summary

**Customer Choice Is Increasing And Accelerating**

Customers are expressing more interest in departing from utility bundled service, especially through Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) formation.

**All LSEs Should Contribute Equitably To Achieve State Energy Policy Goals**

The utilities support the State's clean policy goals. However, implementing policy objectives through utility-only procurement will not be practical as load departures increase.

**Remaining Bundled Customers' Indifference From Load Departures Is Required By State Law**

Remaining utility bundled service customers should not experience cost increases associated with departing load, as required by state law (Pub. Util. Code Sections 366.2 and 366.3).

**Reforms Are Needed To Protect Remaining Bundled Customers**

The Power Charge Indifference Adjustment (PCIA) mechanism is fundamentally flawed and currently results in bundled customer cost increases.

# Significant Numbers Of Communities Are Expressing Interest In CCA Across California


ACTIVE	
<b>PG&amp;E Service Territory</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marin County</li> <li>• Napa County</li> <li>• San Francisco County</li> <li>• San Mateo County</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sonoma County</li> <li>• Cities of Benicia, El Cerrito, Lafayette, Richmond, San Pablo and Walnut Creek</li> </ul>
<b>SCE Service Territory</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Lancaster</li> </ul>	
EXPLORING / IN PROGRESS	
<b>PG&amp;E Service Territory</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alameda County</li> <li>• Contra Costa County</li> <li>• Humboldt County</li> <li>• Lake County</li> <li>• Mendocino County</li> <li>• Monterey County</li> <li>• Placer County</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Luis Obispo County</li> <li>• Placer County</li> <li>• Santa Clara County</li> <li>• Santa Cruz County</li> <li>• Solano County</li> <li>• Yolo County</li> <li>• San Benito County</li> <li>• Santa Barbara County</li> </ul>
<b>SCE Service Territory</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Los Angeles County</li> <li>• Riverside County</li> <li>• San Bernardino County</li> <li>• Santa Barbara County</li> <li>• Ventura County</li> </ul>	<b>SDG&amp;E Service Territory</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of San Diego</li> <li>• San Diego County</li> </ul>



**Note:** Typical timeframe to move from exploration to implementation is 6 to 24 months



# Potential Customer And Load Departure Could Be Up To ~80%



\* Exploring / In Progress CCA load departures reflect local jurisdictions that have issued a CCA municipal ordinance or have stated interest in CCA formation. It also reflects full departure with no opt outs.

\*\* Retail load excludes current Energy Efficiency and Distributed Generation. Additional future departing load from Net Energy Metering is not reflected here.

Source of Total IOU Retail Load: CEC IEPR Form 1.1c 2017 Retail Load based on actual 2014 data

# Protections For Bundled Service Customers From Cost Increases Due To Load Departures

## LEGISLATIVE DIRECTIVE

### Assembly Bill 117 (2002)

Enabled CCA formation and states that the ***“implementation of a CCA program shall not result in a shifting of costs between the customers of the CCA and the bundled service customers.”***

### Decision 04-12-048 (2004)

Acknowledged PU Code 366.2 requires the Commission to authorize CCA formation only if it imposes ***cost-recovery mechanism consistent with the law***

### Senate Bill 350 (2015)

Stated that the CPUC shall ***“ensure that bundled retail customers of an electrical corporation do not experience any cost increases as a result of retail customers of an electrical corporation electing to receive service from other providers”***

## REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION



### Power Charge Indifference Adjustment (PCIA)

Mechanism to recover above-market costs of generation resources procured by the utility prior to the departure of customers

“Market value” of generation resources is determined based on administratively-set benchmarks




### Cost Allocation Mechanism (CAM)

Mechanism to recover costs from all benefiting customers

Allocates resource attributes and net cost to LSEs

## ❌ PCIA Is Not Effective In Preventing Cost Shifting Between Departed Load And Remaining Bundled Service Customers



### CURRENT STATE

#### **Current administratively-set benchmarks significantly overstate market value**


REC and capacity benchmarks are not aligned with current market prices:

- REC benchmark is based on out-of-date confidential IOU contract information
- Capacity benchmark is based on a CEC study of gas peaker operating costs and does not represent current Resource Adequacy capacity market value
- Process for updating benchmarks is contentious. The benchmarks were last updated in 2011, more than 5 years ago


**Fixing benchmarks alone will not solve the underlying flaws of PCIA methodology**

# Current PCIA Benchmarks Are Too High

## Renewable Energy Credit (REC) Benchmark




## Capacity (RA) Benchmark



*\*Estimates shown are based on publicly available information only. Market benchmarks at these prices may still result in cost shifts to bundled customers since they represent transactions different from those the utility may be able to obtain when selling excess power and capacity.*

## The PCIA Methodology Artificially Encourages Departure From Bundled Service And Is Unsustainable




PCIA does not fully recover above-market costs from departing customers

Remaining bundled service customer rates go up to make up shortfall

CCA / DA model becomes increasingly financially attractive

As departing customers avoid their share of existing bundled service costs, the regulatory compact is undermined

# Moving to a Portfolio Allocation Method Is Consistent with State Law and Equitable to All Customers



### BENEFITS

- Eliminates administratively set benchmarks
- Clear, transparent, and effective
  - ✓ *No longer based on confidential data and inaccurate market estimates*
- Facilitates a true-up to reflect actual costs and value
- Meets statutory indifference requirement that all customers pay their share of costs

**A Portfolio Allocation Method replaces inaccurate and contentious administrative prices with true market valuation and an allocation of attributes and is increasingly important with higher levels of load departure**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison  
Company (U 338-E) For Approval Of Its Forecast  
2017 ERRR Proceeding Revenue Requirement.

Application No. 16-05-001  
(Filed May 1, 2016)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that, pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have this day served a true copy of **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S (U 338-E) NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION** on all parties identified on the attached service list for **A.16-05-001**. Service was effected by transmitting copies via e-mail to all parties who have provided an e-mail address and by placing copies in sealed envelopes and causing such envelopes to be delivered by hand or by overnight courier to the offices of the Assigned ALJ(s) or other addressee(s).

**ALJ S. Pat Tsen  
CPUC  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102**

Executed on **February 28 2017**, at Rosemead, California.

/s/ Olivia Gutierrez  
Olivia Gutierrez  
Legal Administrative Assistant  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770



California  
Public Utilities  
Commission



CPUC Home

## CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

### Service Lists

---

**PROCEEDING: A1605001 - EDISON - FOR APPROVA**  
**filer: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY**  
**LIST NAME: LIST**  
**LAST CHANGED: FEBRUARY 22, 2017**

[DOWNLOAD THE COMMA-DELIMITED FILE](#)  
[ABOUT COMMA-DELIMITED FILES](#)

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

---

### Parties

---

HOWARD CHOY  
 GENERAL MGR.  
 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
 OFFICE OF SUSTAINABILITY  
 1100 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90063  
 FOR: COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, OFFICE OF  
 SUSTAINABILITY

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS  
 ATTORNEY  
 DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
 4766 PARK GRANADA, SUITE 209  
 CALABASAS, CA 91302  
 FOR: ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL ENERGY MARKETS  
 AND DIRECT ACCESS CUSTOMER COALITION

RUSSELL A. ARCHER  
 SR. ATTORNEY  
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
 2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. / PO BOX 800  
 ROSEMEAD, CA 91770  
 FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

ZHEN ZHANG  
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
 LEGAL DIVISION  
 ROOM 5130  
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214  
 FOR: ORA

DAN GRIFFITHS  
 ATTORNEY  
 BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH, P.C.  
 915 L STREET, SUITE 1480  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
 FOR: PUBLIC AGENCY COALITION

SCOTT BLAISING  
 COUNSEL  
 BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH P.C.  
 915 L STREET, SUITE 1480  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
 FOR: CITY OF LANCASTER

### Information Only

---



BARBARA BARKOVICH  
CONSULTANT  
BARKOVICH & YAP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH  
CONSULTANT  
BARKOVICH & YAP, INC.  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LAUREN HUDSON  
EXPERT CASE MGR / REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MIKE CADE  
INDUSTRY SPECIALIST  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, OR 00000

SUE MARA  
RTO ADVISORS L.L.C.  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MRW & ASSOCIATES LLC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CASE ADMINISTRATION  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. / PO BOX 800  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

KELLEN C. GILL  
REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP 3-2F  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
LAW DEPT.  
77 BEALE STREET, B30A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-4159

CAROLYN KEHREIN  
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES  
ENERGY USERS FORUM  
2602 CELEBRATION WAY  
WOODLAND, CA 95776

CAMILLE STOUGH, ESQ.  
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH PC  
915 L STREET, STE. 1480  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

LYNN MARSHALL  
CONSULTANT  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
1516 9TH STREET, MS-20  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

## State Service

---

BRIAN LUI  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH  
AREA  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHRISTIAN ETTINGER  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC  
ROOM 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

LAURA A. MARTIN  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

MARYAM GHADESSI  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ENERGY EFFICIENCY BRANCH  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MITCHELL SHAPSON  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
LEGAL DIVISION  
ROOM 5129  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

PATRICK CUNNINGHAM  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH  
AREA  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

S. PAT TSEN  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES  
ROOM 5005  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SCARLETT LIANG-UEJIO  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SUZANNE CASAZZA  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS  
AREA  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

YULIYA SHMIDT  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH  
ROOM 4209  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

---

[TOP OF PAGE](#)  
[BACK TO INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS](#)