

Application: A.26-01-010
Exhibit No.: SDGE-04
Witness: Kazeem Omidiji

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
KAZEEM OMIDIJI
ON BEHALF OF SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

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



JULY 10, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ESA SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY.....	2
A.	Measure Categories: Based on the ED Staff Guidance question relating to Utilities' prioritization of complementary/competing services, what percent of the Utilities proposed measure budgets is devoted to the following measure categories. (Utilities can add a column to their Application Tables (A-1, A-1a, A-1b), classifying each measure in one of the below or additional defined categories): a. Energy efficiency; b. Weatherization; c. Health, Comfort, Safety, d. Electrification, e. Other.....	2
B.	Additional Targets: In addition to the proposed energy savings goals and households treated targets, what type of targets would the Utilities propose, if any? For example:.....	5
a.	Measure category budgets (Ex: 20% of budget for HCS measures);	5
b.	Number of measures or measure category savings (Ex: 10,000 heat pumps or achieve 10% of savings from heat pump measures);	5
c.	Specific measures (Ex: 20% of budget for AC replacements.);	5
d.	Other;	5
e.	For any additional targets, what budget or program impacts would occur, and what policy or rule changes would be needed?.....	5
III.	CARE/FERA SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY	7
A.	Clarify the administrative budgets, subsidy budgets and projected enrollment attributable to implementation of SB 1130 during the proposed program cycle, with a focus on comparison with last cycle's actual spend.	7
B.	Provide a comprehensive analysis of the estimated rate and bill impacts associated with SDG&E's proposal to increase the PEV cap from 6% to 20%, including impacts to: i) CARE participants; ii) non-participating (non-CARE) residential customers; iii) non-residential customers.	10
1.	Impacts to CARE Participants	11
2.	Impacts to Non-Participating (Non-CARE) Residential Customers	11
3.	Impacts to Non-Residential Customers	13
IV.	CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES.....	14
A.	Program Cycle length:	14
1.	Provide any necessary updates to the applications and testimony to reflect a reduced program cycle of four years (through 2031) as opposed to the six years proposed in the applications, including:	14
B.	Concurrent Application System and Data Sharing	25

1.	Explain how the Utilities plan to collaborate with stakeholders to identify opportunities for enhancements to CAS Phase I, whether any of the recommendations from the CAS Working Group’s Phase II Report should be considered through this proceeding as an enhancement to Phase I (third-party income verification service, data sharing with categorical programs, CARE/FERA recertification and PEV applications, etc.), and how the Utilities plan to propose enhancements and additional budget if identified.	25
2.	What data sharing initiatives could be established through CAS as an enhancement to Phase I, or established as individual data sharing agreements with ESA, CARE, or FERA separate from CAS? What are the objectives and proposed use case(s) for cross-program data sharing (income verification, lead generation, automatic enrollment, general targeting of eligible households)? Provide a proposed plan to implement proposed new data sharing initiatives, including next steps and estimated cost.	27
V.	CORRECTIONS TO ATTACHMENT G	28
VI.	WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS	29

Attachment A – 2028-2033 Tables (Updated)

Attachment B - 2028 -2031 Tables

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 On January 16, 2026, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) filed Application (A.) 26-01-
3 010, along with supporting testimony, requesting approval and funding for its Income-Qualified
4 Programs (IQPs) portfolio for 2028-2033. The Application presents program descriptions,
5 budgets, and goals for the 2028-2033 period in support of these IQPs. The programs covered in
6 the Application include the Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) Program, the California Alternate
7 Rates for Energy (CARE) Program, and the Family Electric Rate Assistance (FERA) Program.

8 On April 7, 2026, following a March 12, 2026 prehearing conference (PHC), an *Assigned*
9 *Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling* (Scoping Memo) was issued establishing the scope
10 and schedule of the proceeding, and requesting supplemental testimony from SDG&E, Southern
11 California Edison Company (SCE), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), and Southern
12 California Gas Company (SoCalGas), collectively the investor-owned utilities (IOUs), regarding
13 the ESA, CARE, and FERA programs. The Scoping Memo requires Supplemental Testimony to
14 provide additional information on specific topics for all IOUs and SDG&E-only.¹

15 On May 1, 2026, PG&E, on behalf of the IOUs, submitted a procedural email requesting
16 clarification regarding the supplemental testimony, specifically concerning the level of detail the
17 IOUs should provide to support testimony on proposed changes to the IQP programs based on a
18 four-year cycle compared to the IOUs' proposed six-year cycle.

19 On May 28, 2026, a subsequent ruling was issued by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ
20 Ruling) providing the IOUs direction regarding supplemental testimony.² The ALJ Ruling
21 additionally included a Staff Report related to the Community Help and Assistance with Natural

¹ *Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling* (April 7, 2026) at Attachment 5: Utility Supplemental Testimony.

² *Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Responding to Procedural Email, Directing Additional Supplemental Testimony and Adding Staff Report to Proceeding Record* (May 28, 2026).

Gas (CHANGES) Program for the parties to consider when preparing testimony, and requested additional supplemental testimony from PG&E, SCE and SoCalGas to be submitted on August 10, 2026.³

II. ESA SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

A. **Measure Categories: Based on the ED Staff Guidance⁴ question relating to Utilities’ prioritization of complementary/competing services, what percent of the Utilities proposed measure budgets is devoted to the following measure categories. (Utilities can add a column to their Application Tables (A-1, A-1a, A-1b), classifying each measure in one of the below or additional defined categories): a. Energy efficiency; b. Weatherization; c. Health, Comfort, Safety, d. Electrification, e. Other.**

Consistent with the broad definition in Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section (§) 2790 (b)(1) and (c) and (e), “weatherization” may include the following measures:

(A) Attic insulation

(B) Caulking

(C) Weatherstripping

(D) Low-flow Showerhead

(E) Water heater blanket

(F) Door and building envelope repairs that reduce air infiltration

Additionally, “weatherization” may also include other building conservation measures, energy management technology, energy-efficient appliances, and energy education programs

³ On June 29, 2026, the Administrative Law Judge issued *Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Directing Additional Party Record Development Related to Definitional Issues* providing additional questions for the parties to address in supplemental testimony or briefing. SDG&E intends to respond to provide any supplemental testimony necessary to address these questions concurrently with the August 10, 2026 submission of supplemental testimony by the other IOUs ordered in the May 26, 2026 ALJ Ruling.

⁴ See Email from CPUC dated October 31, 2024, attaching ED Staff Guidance to IOUs on ESA/CARE/FERA/CAS - October 2024.

1 where “energy management technology” may include a product, service or software that allows a
2 customer to better understand and manage electricity or gas use.⁵

3 Since the PUC allowed classification of most measures as “weatherization,” the IOUs
4 met and agreed to realign the measure classifications in Application Tables A-1 and A-1a for the
5 purposes of this response, based on the following:

- 6 a. Energy Efficiency (EE): Replacing or upgrading equipment to reduce energy
7 use
- 8 b. Weatherization: Improving the building envelope to reduce air leakage and
9 infiltration
- 10 c. Health, Comfort and Safety (HCS): Measures with less than one kWh or one
11 therm of annual energy savings
- 12 d. Electrification: Converting from one CPUC-regulated fuel to another
13 regulated fuel, and/or from an unregulated fuel to a CPUC- regulated fuel
- 14 e. Other: Customer enrollment and Energy Education.

15 Measures may be classified differently among IOUs based on savings sources, savings
16 values, climate zones and housing types. SDG&E’s measure categorizations are provided in
17 Attachments A and B, Tables A-1 and A-1a. The percentage of the total proposed budget
18 allocated to each measure category is summarized below by Program for ESA Main and MFWB
19 for the 6-year and 4-year cycles.

20

⁵ PUC § 2790(b)(1) and (c) and (e).

Table 1: ESA Main Percent of Budget by Measure Category by Year, (6-Year Cycle)

Measure Category	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033
Energy Efficiency	66%	66%	66%	66%	66%	66%
Health Comfort & Safety	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Weatherization	14%	14%	14%	15%	15%	15%
Electrification	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other – Customer Enrollment	16%	16%	16%	16%	15%	15%
Total ⁶	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2: MFWB Percent of Budget by Measure Category by Year, (6-Year Cycle)

Measure Category	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033
Energy Efficiency	42%	45%	45%	46%	47%	47%
Health Comfort & Safety	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Weatherization	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Electrification	36%	33%	34%	34%	34%	33%
Other – Customer Enrollment	16%	14%	14%	14%	13%	13%
Total ⁷	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3: ESA Main Percent of Budget by Measure Category by Year, (4-Year Cycle)

Measure Category	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031
Energy Efficiency	66%	66%	66%	66%
Health Comfort & Safety	3%	4%	4%	4%
Weatherization	14%	14%	14%	15%
Electrification	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other – Customer Enrollment	16%	16%	16%	16%
Total ⁸	100%	100%	100%	100%

⁶ Totals may not sum due to rounding.

⁷ Totals may not sum due to rounding.

⁸ Totals may not sum due to rounding.

Table 4: MFWB Percent of Budget by Measure Category by Year, (4-Year Cycle)

Measure Category	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031
Energy Efficiency	42%	45%	45%	46%
Health Comfort & Safety	5%	5%	5%	5%
Weatherization	1%	1%	1%	1%
Electrification	36%	33%	34%	34%
Other – Customer Enrollment	16%	14%	14%	14%
Total ⁹	100%	100%	100%	100%

For the Electrification Pilot, SDG&E assumes that 100% of the pilot measure budget will be allocated to electrification measures category, while all other measures are funded through the ESA Main program budget.

B. Additional Targets: In addition to the proposed energy savings goals and households treated targets, what type of targets would the Utilities propose, if any? For example:

- a. Measure category budgets (Ex: 20% of budget for HCS measures);
- b. Number of measures or measure category savings (Ex: 10,000 heat pumps or achieve 10% of savings from heat pump measures);
- c. Specific measures (Ex: 20% of budget for AC replacements.);
- d. Other;
- e. For any additional targets, what budget or program impacts would occur, and what policy or rule changes would be needed?

As discussed in the Prepared Testimony of Roland Mollen, SDG&E is not proposing any additional targets. Instead, SDG&E intends to explore more efficient methods of tracking and reporting existing outcomes and enhancing visibility into key data points such as non-energy benefits (NEBs) and household bill savings by reporting results across quartiles or quintiles,

⁹ Totals may not sum due to rounding.

1 rather than a single household average. Enhanced tracking and reporting will help assess the true
2 outcomes of current program activities and generate insights that can inform potential
3 adjustments or refinements to program design, if necessary.¹⁰

4 While performance targets are important for driving behavior and accountability,
5 SDG&E does not recommend expanding the number of targets due to the potential for
6 unintended consequences. Additional targets may dilute program focus, create prioritization
7 challenges, and ultimately reduce overall program effectiveness and customer benefits. Because
8 targets serve as primary indicators of program success, Program Administrators may be
9 encouraged to optimize performance based on specific targets, which can result in the de-
10 prioritization of other valuable program elements.

11 For example, establishing a target of installing 1,000 heat pumps would create a singular
12 focus and direct efforts toward identifying customers most likely to adopt this technology while
13 inadvertently neglecting those who may be less likely to adopt heat pumps but could still benefit
14 from other measures. A similar dynamic was observed during the current program cycle with
15 SoCalGas and its contractors. When the priority and incentives were tied strictly to the energy
16 savings goals, contractors stopped installing HCS measures that provided zero or negative
17 savings. This occurred despite the meaningful value those measures provided to customers,
18 demonstrating how narrowly defined goals or targets can distort program outcomes.¹¹

19 Establishing and implementing targets for specific measures, measure categories, or
20 budget allocations could create significant challenges by shifting focus away from the core

¹⁰ Exhibit (Ex.) SDG&E-03, *Prepared Direct Testimony of Roland Mollen, Horace (Ty) Tatum, and Mia Graff on Behalf of SDG&E's Energy Savings Assistance Program Plans and Budgets for Program Years 2028-2033* (January 16, 2026) (Ex. SDG&E-03 (Mollen Direct)), at ESA-45.

¹¹ A.19-11-003, Annual Report of SCE on Energy Savings Assistance and California Alternate Rates For Energy Programs For 2024 (May 1, 2025), at 2 and 28.

1 objective of serving all customers with the full range of feasible measures. Each household is
2 unique, with varying conditions, constraints, and preferences, many of which are unknown until
3 a thorough assessment is conducted. Predefined targets fail to account for this variability and
4 may limit the ability to deliver the most suitable and beneficial solutions for each customer.

5 While program goals and targets are intended to shape behavior and drive performance,
6 too many targets can create conflicts and result in unintended consequences that undermine the
7 broader program objectives of delivering deeper energy savings, improving health, comfort and
8 safety, and reducing energy burden for individual households. Instead, they encourage a
9 narrower approach that may not align with individual household needs.

10 **III. CARE/FERA SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY**

11 **A. Clarify the administrative budgets, subsidy budgets and projected** 12 **enrollment attributable to implementation of SB 1130 during the proposed** 13 **program cycle, with a focus on comparison with last cycle's actual spend.**

14 Senate Bill (SB) 1130,¹² effective January 1, 2025, expanded eligibility for the Family
15 Electric Rate Assistance (FERA) Program by removing the prior household-size minimum,
16 thereby extending eligibility to one- and two-person households within the statutory income
17 range (200% plus \$1 to 250% of Federal Poverty Guidelines). This statutory change nearly
18 doubled the estimated FERA-eligible population – from approximately 41,000 households in
19 2024 to 81,000 households in 2025 – and is the primary driver of changes in FERA budgets and
20 enrollment estimates for PY 2028-2033.¹³

¹² SB 1130 (Bradford, 2024), *available at*:
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240SB1130.

¹³ Ex. SDG&E-02, *Prepared Direct Testimony of Roland Mollen, Horace (Ty) Tatum, and Mia Graff on Behalf of SDG&E's CARE and FERA Program Plans and Budgets for Program Years 2028-2033* (January 16, 2026) (Ex. SDG&E-02 (CARE/FERA Direct)) at CARE/FERA - 56-58.

1 Accordingly, SDG&E proposes a six-year FERA Administrative budget of \$12.2 million
2 and a forecasted FERA Discount Budget of \$84.6 million for the proposed PY 2028-2033
3 program cycle.¹⁴ Effectively 100 percent of SDG&E's increased requested FERA administrative
4 budgets, rate discount budgets, and projected enrollment growth are directly attributable to the
5 implementation of SB 1130, consistent with the FERA enrollment goal of 70%, and reflect:

- 6 • Expanded Marketing, Education, and Outreach (ME&O) activities to reach
7 the newly eligible population, with ME&O funding increasing from
8 approximately \$0.38 million in PY 2026 to approximately \$1.1 million in PY
9 2028, with modest annual escalations thereafter;
- 10 • Increased processing, certification, recertification, and post-enrollment
11 verification activities to support substantially higher projected enrollment
12 volumes;
- 13 • Significant investments in Information Technology and Programming (an
14 increase of approximately 738 percent relative to the prior cycle) to support
15 automation, a standalone FERA enrollment application authorized by SB
16 1130, and integration with SDG&E's digital platforms.¹⁵

17 By comparison, during the prior cycle, FERA enrollment remained relatively low, and
18 administrative spending reflected the narrower eligibility requirements and legacy processes.

19 SDG&E forecasts a FERA customer rate discount budget of approximately \$84.6 million
20 for PY 2028-2033, for a total FERA program budget of \$96.8 million when combined with

¹⁴ Application of SDG&E for Approval of Low-Income Assistance Programs and Budgets for Program Years 2028-2033, Attachment G at 17.

¹⁵ Ex. SDG&E-02 (CARE/FERA Direct) at CARE/FERA - 36-39.

1 administrative costs. This FERA rate discount budget is substantially higher than prior-cycle
2 experience and reflects:

- 3 • The near doubling of the estimated eligible FERA population following SB
4 1130 (from approximately 41,000 households pre-SB 1130 to approximately
5 81,000 households post-SB 1130);
- 6 • A projected increase in participation from approximately 21 percent in 2025
7 (about 16,953 households enrolled) to 70 percent by PY 2033 (approximately
8 56,713 enrolled households).

9 In the prior cycle, actual FERA spending was constrained by low enrollment driven by
10 restrictive eligibility criteria. SB 1130 fundamentally changed this criterion and necessitates a
11 significantly larger rate discount budget.

12 SB 1130 is expected to materially change FERA enrollment outcomes compared to the
13 prior cycle:

- 14 • Last cycle actuals: As of 2025, FERA enrollment was approximately 23 percent of
15 the estimated eligible population post-implementation of SB 1130 changes.
- 16 • Proposed cycle estimate: SDG&E forecasts incremental annual growth achieving the
17 Commission-authorized 70 percent enrollment goal by PY 2033, consistent with
18 statutory intent and supported by enhanced ME&O, automation, and community-
19 based enrollment strategies.

20 In summary, when compared to last cycle's actual FERA spend and enrollment
21 experience, the proposed increase in FERA administrative budgets, rate discount budgets, and
22 enrollment projections for PY 2028-2033 are directly attributable to SB 1130. The legislation
23 fundamentally expanded program eligibility, thereby driving higher enrollment, necessitating

1 expanded administration, and resulting in materially higher rate discount expenditures. While
2 SDG&E would continue to pursue increased enrollment over time to meet program enrollment
3 goals absent SB 1130, growth in participation and associated costs are projected due to SB1130.

4 **B. Provide a comprehensive analysis of the estimated rate and bill impacts**
5 **associated with SDG&E's proposal to increase the PEV cap from 6% to**
6 **20%, including impacts to: i) CARE participants; ii) non-participating (non-**
7 **CARE) residential customers; iii) non-residential customers.**

8 SDG&E's proposal to increase the CARE post-enrollment verification (PEV) cap from 6
9 percent to up to 20 percent is intended to strengthen program integrity by ensuring that CARE
10 benefits continue to be provided to customers who meet the program's eligibility requirements.
11 The estimated rate and bill impacts associated with SDG&E's 20% PEV cap were previously
12 incorporated into SDG&E's Application (A.26-01-010). Consistent with SDG&E's CARE
13 Program objectives and the Commission-established 90 percent CARE enrollment goal, the PEV
14 cap proposal balances continued access to bill assistance for eligible customers with prudent
15 administration of the program on behalf of all ratepayers.¹⁶

16 As reflected in the Company's supporting workpapers, the analysis considers two
17 primary drivers:

- 18 • Incremental administrative costs required to conduct additional PEV
19 activities; and
- 20 • Offsetting reductions in ineligible program participation, which decreases the
21 overall CARE revenue requirement recovered in rates.

22 Taken together, these effects result in an outcome that becomes increasingly beneficial
23 for all customer classes over time as eligibility accuracy improves.

¹⁶ Ex. SDG&E-02 (CARE/FERA Direct) at CARE/FERA - 8-11.

1. Impacts to CARE Participants

Bill impacts to CARE participants depend on whether customers continue to meet eligibility requirements:

- **CARE customers:** Customers who confirm eligibility through the PEV process will continue to receive CARE discounts with no change to their bills. The incremental CARE administrative costs associated with the additional PEV activities are recovered from non-CARE residential and non-residential customers.
- **Customers determined to be ineligible:** Customers who do not meet eligibility requirements for CARE at the time of verification will either be enrolled in FERA (if eligible for FERA) or de-enrolled from CARE. These customers will experience bill increases consistent with the removal of the CARE discount. While these impacts may be noticeable at the individual level, they reflect the correction of eligibility status and ensure that program benefits are directed to qualifying households.

Overall, the proposal improves targeting CARE benefits while maintaining CARE discounts for eligible participants.

2. Impacts to Non-Participating (Non-CARE) Residential Customers

For non-participating residential customers, the workpapers demonstrate that the proposal results in small bill impacts, with a modest beneficial trend over time.

- **Administrative cost effect:** Expanding PEV activities results in a slight increase in CARE program administrative costs.

- **Reduced CARE revenue requirement through improved eligibility**

verification: By identifying and removing ineligible participants, the program better aligns benefits with eligible customers, which reduces the overall costs recovered in rates. Workpapers indicate these reductions offset incremental administrative costs, depending on realized eligibility outcomes.

As a result, non-CARE residential customers experience near-neutral impacts initially, followed by incremental ratepayer benefits over time as program participation more closely aligns with eligibility criteria.

If SDG&E's proposal to increase the CARE PEV cap from 6 percent to up to 20 percent is approved:

- The typical non-CARE residential electric customer using 400 kWh per month would see a monthly bill decrease of approximately \$0.24 as compared to the current CARE PEV cap of 6 percent.¹⁷
- The typical non-CARE residential gas customer using 24 therms per month would see a monthly bill decrease of approximately \$0.06 as compared to the current CARE PEV cap of 6 percent.¹⁸

¹⁷ *Id.* at 9.

¹⁸ *Id.*

Table 5: Estimated Rate and Bill Impacts of SDG&E's Proposed Increased CARE PEV Cap from 6% to 20%

Illustrative Proposed Electric Rate Impacts by Customer Class¹⁹		
Customer Class	Proposed 20% CARE PEV Rate Decrease (¢/kWh)	Percentage Rate Decrease (%)
Residential	0.066	0.15%
Small Commercial	0.064	0.16%
Medium and Large C&I	0.064	0.17%
Agricultural	0.063	0.23%
Lighting	0.004	0.01%
System Total	0.064	0.16%

Illustrative Proposed Gas Rate Impacts by Customer Class²⁰		
Customer Class	Proposed 20% CARE PEV Rate Decrease (¢/therm)	Percentage Rate Decrease (%)
Core		
Residential	0.243	0.09%
Commercial/Industrial	0.243	0.15%
Natural Gas Vehicles	0.243	0.27%
Non-Core		
Commercial/Industrial	0.243	0.24%
System Average Rate	0.222	0.14%

3. Impacts to Non-Residential Customers

Non-residential customers experience similarly small and directionally favorable impacts.

- The administrative costs associated with increased PEV are distributed across a broad revenue base, resulting in minimal per-customer bill effects.

¹⁹ CARE customers are exempt from paying into CARE specific programs. Decrease calculated comparing 2033, which is the electric peak year impact, to current effective rates as of January 1, 2026. Rate decrease will be the same for bundled and unbundled customers. Percentage change reflects comparison to total bundled rates.

²⁰ CARE customers are exempt from paying into CARE specific programs. Decrease calculated comparing 2032, which is the gas peak year impact, to current effective rates as of January 1, 2026.

- Reduced CARE revenue requirement leads to lower cost recovery obligations for non-residential classes.

Accordingly, while bill impacts are de minimis on an individual basis, the overall effect is slightly beneficial, particularly over the longer term.

In conclusion, as demonstrated in the workpapers, increasing the CARE PEV cap to up to 20 percent produces minimal per-customer bill impacts while improving overall ratepayer outcomes. Although modest administrative costs are incurred to expand verification activities, these costs are offset by reductions in CARE revenue requirement resulting from improved eligibility verification.

IV. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

A. Program Cycle length:

This section discusses the changes to SDG&E's application and testimony that result from reducing the proposed 6-year program cycle to the requested illustration of a 4-year program cycle. Any program implementation aspects not discussed are assumed to remain as originally proposed.

1. Provide any necessary updates to the applications and testimony to reflect a reduced program cycle of four years (through 2031) as opposed to the six years proposed in the applications, including:

a. Implementation schedules, including but not limited to: Utilities solicitations, Utilities studies, and SDG&E's electrification pilot

ESA Main and MFWB

SDG&E's proposal to reduce the program cycle by a third (33%), from six years to four years, would be accomplished by eliminating the final two years of the proposed ESA Program Cycle (PY 2032 and PY 2033). While SDG&E provides a four-year outlook for comparative

1 purposes, its preferred program cycle remains for six years. Under the shortened cycle, SDG&E
2 does not anticipate changes to the cycle transition period, including solicitations and ramp-up
3 activities for ESA Main and MFWB. However, the compressed timeline creates additional strain
4 on program implementers and contractors, limiting their ability to operate effectively and
5 efficiently. A shorter program cycle reduces the duration of stable operations which puts
6 constraints on any additional time needed to build experience, establish processes, and develop
7 strong working relationships.

8 As reflected in the Prepared Direct Testimony of Kazeem Omidiji²¹ regarding
9 stakeholder feedback, shorter cycles increase uncertainty, costs, and administrative burden, and
10 can disrupt workforce stability. Contractors often manage multiple programs and need adequate
11 time to ramp up staffing, deliver services, and implement improvements. A four-year cycle
12 compresses these activities and may require repeated workforce reductions and rehiring. At this
13 time, SDG&E is unable to quantify the implementer and contractor challenges, therefore no
14 changes have been made to program forecasting assumptions. These constraints may have
15 downstream impacts on the quality of service received by customers and achieving program
16 goals.

17 ESA implementers and contractors commented during SDG&E's stakeholder
18 engagement meetings, which were held prior to the original application filing and again prior to
19 this supplemental filing, that a six-year cycle provides greater stability for workforce retention
20 and enables contractors to invest in training, capacity building, and program enhancements.²² It

²¹ Ex. SDG&E-01, *Prepared Direct Testimony of Kazeem Omidiji on Behalf of SDG&E's Policy – Energy Savings Assistance, CARE, and FERA Program Plans and Budgets for Program Years 2028-2033* (January 16, 2026) (Ex. SDG&E (Omidiji Direct)), at KO - 15-16.

²² Ex. SDG&E-03 (Mollen Direct), Appendix A –SDG&E Stakeholder Meeting List, Implementer and Contractor Follow-up Meeting on June 5, 2026.

1 reduces the need for frequent solicitations and program redesigns, lowering administrative
2 burden and operational disruption. A longer cycle allows sufficient time for ramp-up, full
3 implementation, optimization, and meaningful evaluation of program performance before major
4 changes are introduced. A longer cycle also allows time to strengthen essential community
5 partnerships and collaboration and leverage with other programs in support of shared goals.

6 SDG&E's solicitations schedule will not change with a 4-year cycle, but the
7 implementation schedule for the Electrification Pilot will change as noted in Table 6. Program
8 solicitations will be staggered, with ESA Main and the Electrification Pilot going out to bid
9 together after the Decision is issued in mid-2027, followed by MFWB in Q1 2028. As discussed
10 in the Prepared Direct Testimony of Kazeem Omidiji, implementers and contractors have stated
11 that they are less interested in bidding for a shorter program considering the solicitation process
12 can be complex and costly. It also requires a high level of expertise and a substantial investment
13 of time to ensure compliance and completeness of proposals. These burdens can deter
14 participation, reducing the pool of qualified candidates. With a shorter program cycle, potential
15 bidders may conclude that the effort required does not justify the limited opportunity, ultimately
16 limiting competition and innovation in program delivery. SDG&E contends that a six-year cycle
17 with the use of a mid-cycle advice letter as a formal mechanism to propose adjustments to
18 program goals, targets, and design elements, subject to stakeholder and Commission review and
19 approval, may be more efficient than going through a new program application process within
20 two years of approval of the current Application.

21 Table 6 below shows the revisions to the preliminary schedule of key milestones when
22 moving from a six-year cycle to a four-year cycle. The original table appears in the Prepared
23 Direct Testimony of Kazeem Omidiji, at KO-16, Table 2.

Table 6: Revised Preliminary Schedule of Key Milestones for Program Cycle 2028-2033,
updated for Program Cycle 2028-2031

Milestone	ESA Main	ESA Electrification Pilot	MFWB
Commission Decision	June 2027	June 2027	June 2027
RFP Release to Bidders	September 2027	September 2027	March 2028
Finalize Selection	November 2027	November 2027	May 2028
Process & Impact Eval Results – Current Cycle	Q4 2027	Q1 2028	Q4 2028
New Program Contracts Executed	April 2028	April 2028	October 2028
Implementer Ramp-Up Activities	May – July 2028	May – December July 2028	November 2028 - January 2029
Established Operations	September 2028	February 2029 September 2028	March 2029
Mid-Cycle Advice Letter	December 2030	December 2030	December 2030
Process Impact Eval Results – New Cycle	TBD 2030	TBD 2031 – 2032	TBD 2030
Application Filing for PY 2033 2032+	January 2032 -2030	January 2032 -2030	January 2032 -2030

Studies

In SDG&E’s proposed six-year cycle proposal, the statewide ESA Main and MFWB Impact and Process Evaluations were to start in PY 2028, with 2029 serving as the representative year for program data analysis.²³ The data analysis activities were to begin in PY 2030 following the required 12 months of data and be completed in PY 2031. These studies would assess energy savings, cost-effectiveness, and customer outcomes associated with program participation, and will be instrumental in refining measure offerings and delivery models. By reducing the cycle length, the results of these evaluations will not be available in time to be

²³ Ex. SDG&E-03 (Mollen Direct) at ESA-169.

1 considered for program improvements for the following cycle (PY 2032+) since the application
2 for the following cycle will need to be filed in early 2030 in order to have a decision issued in
3 mid-2031.

4 The budget for the Impact and Process Evaluations studies was allocated across PYs
5 2030, 2031 and 2032 for all of the IOUs in the PY 2028 –2033 application. With a 4-year cycle,
6 the budget planned for 2032 would need to be reallocated to 2031. The IOU managing the
7 studies vendor would need to ensure the study process is completed, and final invoicing occurs in
8 that year.

9 ***Pilot***

10 The shortened program cycle does affect the implementation schedule for the
11 Electrification Pilot. Originally, implementation was planned over a five-year period, PY 2028
12 through PY 2032, and included an extended ramp-up phase (May to Dec 2028) compared to ESA
13 Main (May to July 2028) to avoid overburdening implementers and contractors given the
14 complexity of the program. With a 4-year cycle, program ramp-up would need to be
15 compressed, and customer enrollments would need to begin earlier in Q3 - Q4 2028 instead of
16 PY 2029. Final measure installations, program ramp-down activities, and the evaluation study
17 will need to be done in PY 2031 instead of PY 2032, as planned under the 6-year cycle. This
18 condensed timeline introduces some challenges, which are discussed in Section (7) ESA
19 Electrification Pilot Update.

b. ESA/CARE/FERA tables, including program year budgets, goals, households treated, etc.

i. ESA Portfolio Updates

(1) ESA Portfolio Budget Updates

SDG&E's proposed budget for a 4-year cycle is \$127,844,510 for the ESA Portfolio, representing a 34% reduction compared to the proposed 6-year cycle amount of \$194,756,234.

Table 7: Comparison of 4-Year and 6-Year Portfolio Budgets

Program	PY 2021-2026 ²⁴	PY 2028-2033 6 yr	PY 2028-2031 4 yr	% Change Between 4 yr and 6 yr Budgets
ESA Main	\$ 118,650,626	\$ 132,664,762	\$ 85,913,842	-35%
Multifamily ²⁵	\$ 48,587,038	\$ 54,393,653	\$ 34,233,984	-37%
Pilots	\$ 7,633,415	\$ 7,697,819	\$ 7,696,684	0%
Total	\$ 174,871,079	\$ 194,756,234	\$ 127,844,510	-34%

(2) Annual and Cycle Ramp-up Costs Update

Table 8 illustrates the annual budget difference between the 6-year and the 4-year ESA Portfolio Cycle. Overall, the 4-year cycle budget is \$66,911,724 less than the 6-year cycle budget. The removal of PY 2032 and 2033 from the 6-year cycle decreases the 4-year cycle budget by \$69,048,299. This reduction is partially offset by the addition of \$2,136,575 to accommodate the earlier implementation of the Electrification Pilot and EM&V Studies. Specifically, the change in cycle length shifts \$2,066,574 from PY 2032-2033 into PY 2028-2031 for the Electrification Pilot across the Energy Efficiency (EE), Administrative, Direct

²⁴ Total cycle budget was adjusted to include the 2021 full year budget as reported in A.19-11-003, Annual Report Activity of SDG&E on Low Income Assistance Programs for 2021 (June 1, 2022) at Appendix G, Table 1 – ESA Program Overall Program Expenses, and Table 1A - Expenses Funded from 2009-2016 Unspent Program Funds. All other years are from D.21-06-015, at Attachment 1 at Table 11: ESA Approved Budgets (SDG&E).

²⁵ The MFWB Program budget includes Single Point of Contact (SPOC).

Implementation, and Marketing and Outreach budgets and the EM&V budget shifts \$70,000 for studies from PY 2032 to PY 2031.

Table 8: 6-Year to 4-Year Cycle – Annual Change (\$)

	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033	PY 2028-2033
EE Budget	\$500,000	\$230,000	\$360,693	\$326,098	\$(26,831,944)	\$(26,216,958)	\$(51,632,111)
Administrative	\$96,774	\$40,230	-	-	\$(3,270,946)	\$(3,268,252)	\$(6,402,194)
Direct Implementation (DI)	\$24,138	-	-	\$358,977	\$(2,998,334)	\$(2,945,356)	\$(5,560,574)
Marketing and Outreach	\$114,664	\$15,000	-	-	\$(1,671,879)	\$(1,622,559)	\$(3,164,774)
EM&V	-	-	-	\$70,000	\$(136,000)	\$(86,071)	\$(152,071)
Portfolio Total	\$735,576	\$285,230	\$360,693	755,075	\$(34,909,103)	\$(34,139,196)	\$(66,911,724)

(3) Revenue Requirement, Rate Impacts and Cost Recovery Updates

Updates to the revenue requirements and rate impacts are shown in Attachment B, Tables 7, D-1, and D-2.

(4) ESA Programs and Energy Savings and Demand Reduction Goals Updates

SDG&E's proposed ESA Portfolio savings forecast for a 4-year cycle vs. a 6-year cycle amount is described in Table 9. The impact is a result of removing PY 2032 and PY 2033; there were no changes in annual savings forecasts for PY 2028-2031 for the 4-year cycle.

Table 9: Portfolio SDG&E Savings Forecast

Goal	PY 2028-2033	PY 2028-2031	% Change
GWH	15	10	-35%
KW	4112	2,690	-35%
Therms	1,185,077	772,497	-35%

(5) ESA Main Update

SDG&E's proposed ESA Main savings forecast for a 4-year cycle vs. a 6-year cycle is described in Table 10 and homes treated in Table 11. The impact is a result of removing PY 2032 and PY 2033; there were no changes made to the annual savings or homes treated forecasted for PY 2028-2031 for the 4-year cycle. Although a four-year cycle is presented for comparability, SDG&E believes a six-year horizon better achieves improved quality over time to enable structured solicitations, deliver reliable and consistent service, strengthen essential community partnerships, and allow sufficient time for contractors to scale operations.

Table 10: ESA Main SDG&E Savings Forecast

Goal	PY 2028-2033	PY 2028-2031	% Change
GWH	8.56	5.69	-34%
KW	2,808.88	1,865.88	-34%
Therms	637,579.48	423,424.48	-34%

Table 11: ESA Main Households Treated

	PY 2028-2033	PY 2028-2031	% Change
SF Homes Treated	30,600	20,400	-33%
Mobile Homes Treated	3,900	2,600	-33%

(6) ESA MFWB Update

The MFWB program includes both the original six-year cycle (PY 2028–2033) proposal and a requested four-year cycle (PY 2028–2031). The 4-year cycle reflects a direct truncation of the 6-year forecast, with PY 2032–2033 removed and no changes made to program design, measure mix, delivery approach, or targeting strategy. Accordingly, no programmatic updates are associated with the 4-year cycle, and all differences between the two scenarios are attributable solely to the shortened implementation period.

While the four-year cycle is presented for comparability, SDG&E maintains that a six-year program horizon better supports effective program implementation. A longer cycle allows for a structured solicitation schedule, adequate implementer ramp-up, and sufficient time for contractors to scale operations to meet program demand, ultimately supporting more efficient and consistent program delivery.

Table 12 and Table 13 present a comparison of key program goals and participation metrics across the 6-year and 4-year cycles.

Table 12: MFWB Savings Forecast

Goal	PY 2028-2033	PY 2028-2031	% Change
GWH	6	4	-36%
KW	1,304	825	-37%
Therms	547,498	349,073	-36%

Note: ESACET values are expected to remain consistent on a per-unit basis, given no changes to measure mix or delivery approach.

Table 13: MFWB Households and Units Treated

	PY 2028-2033	PY 2028-2031	% Change
MF In-Units Treated	25,000	16,200	-35%
Properties	150	90	-40%

(7) ESA Electrification Pilot Update

To support a condensed 4-year schedule, SDG&E proposes a strategic front-loading of marketing and outreach efforts. By increasing early-stage customer engagement and awareness, the Pilot can drive faster enrollment and ensure timely deployment of electrification measures.

With respect to outputs, SDG&E anticipates that the condensed timeline will not materially alter overall program performance. Reductions in administrative costs associated with the shortened cycle have been reallocated toward increased marketing, outreach, and direct

measure implementation. This reallocation is expected to support the delivery of electrification measures, but the revised timeframe may impact the program’s ability to reach and service the targeted 300–350 homes.

(8) ESA ME&O Updates

No changes to ME&O activities are being considered as a result of reducing the program cycle from six years to four years. The budget and overall strategy for ESA Main and MFWB will remain unchanged, with only the final two years of the cycle being eliminated. For the Electrification Pilot, ME&O activities will commence earlier and reflect a modest budget increase, as previously noted.

ii. CARE Program Goals and Budget Updates

SDG&E’s proposed budget for a 4-year cycle is \$898,585,388 for the CARE Program representing a 34% reduction compared to the proposed 6-year cycle amount of \$1,362,090,099.

Table 14: Comparison of 4-Year and 6-Year Portfolio Budgets

Categories	PY 2028-2033	PY 2028-2031	% Change
CARE Administrative	\$ 49,149,749	\$ 32,029,592	-35%
CARE Discount	\$ 1,312,940,350	\$ 866,555,796	-34%
CARE Total	\$ 1,362,090,099	\$ 898,585,388	-34%

Table 15: PY 2028-2033 CARE Enrollment/Participation Goals

Program Year	Estimated Net Enrollment	Estimated Year End Participation	Estimated Eligible Households ²⁶	Estimated PY End Enrollment Rate
2028	-5,000	277,502	287,738	96%
2029	-4,500	273,002	287,738	95%
2030	-4,000	269,002	287,738	93%
2031	-3,500	265,502	287,738	92%
2032	-3,000	262,502	287,738	91%
2033	-2,500	260,002	287,738	90%

²⁶ Estimated CARE Enrollment Rate will fluctuate based on updated CARE Eligibility information.

SDG&E's CARE Annual Enrollment/Participation Goals stay the same regardless of whether the program cycle is 2028-2033 or 2028-2031.

(1) Revenue Requirement and Rate Impacts Updates

Updates to the revenue requirements and rate impacts are shown in Attachment B, Tables B-1, D-1, and D-2.

iii. FERA Program Updates

(1) FERA Program Goals and Budget Updates

SDG&E's proposed budget for a 4-year cycle is \$60,169,937 for the FERA Program representing a 38% reduction compared to the proposed 6-year cycle amount of \$96,806,285.

Table 16: Comparison of 4-Year and 6-Year Portfolio Budgets

Categories	PY 2028-2033	PY 2028-2031	% Change
FERA Administrative	\$ 12,217,062	\$ 8,042,123	-34%
FERA Discount	\$ 84,589,223	\$ 52,127,814	-38%
FERA Total	\$ 96,806,285	\$ 60,169,937	-38%

Table 17: PY 2028-2033 FERA Enrollment/Participation Goals

Program Year	Estimated Net Enrollment	Estimated Year End Participation	Estimated Eligible ⁴⁸ Households	Estimated PY End Enrollment Rate
2028	4,366	38,484	81,019	47.5%
2029	4,051	42,535	81,019	52.5%
2030	4,051	46,586	81,019	57.5%
2031	4,051	50,637	81,019	62.5%
2032	3,646	54,283	81,019	67.0%
2033	2,431	56,713	81,019	70.0%

(2) Revenue Requirement and Rate Impacts Updates

Updates to the revenue requirements and rate impacts are shown in Attachment B, Tables C-1, D-1, and D-2.

1 **B. Concurrent Application System and Data Sharing**

- 2 **1. Explain how the Utilities plan to collaborate with stakeholders to**
3 **identify opportunities for enhancements to CAS Phase I, whether any**
4 **of the recommendations from the CAS Working Group's Phase II**
5 **Report should be considered through this proceeding as an**
6 **enhancement to Phase I (third-party income verification service, data**
7 **sharing with categorical programs, CARE/FERA recertification and**
8 **PEV applications, etc.), and how the Utilities plan to propose**
9 **enhancements and additional budget if identified.**

10 SDG&E appreciates the stakeholder collaboration that has already occurred through the
11 CAS Working Group and the Commission-directed development process for CAS Phase I. The
12 Commission established the CAS Working Group specifically to provide recommendations
13 regarding CAS design requirements, functionality, and implementation considerations, and the
14 approved Phase I scope reflects those recommendations determined by the Energy Division and
15 the Commission to be appropriate for implementation.²⁷

16 At this time, SDG&E does not propose additional enhancements to CAS Phase I beyond
17 the scope approved by the Commission. CAS Phase I remains under development and has not
18 yet been deployed to customers. As a result, SDG&E believes it would be premature to evaluate
19 or implement additional functionality before operational experience is obtained and the online
20 CAS application performance can be assessed. Expanding the scope of Phase I before launch
21 could introduce unnecessary implementation risk, increase project complexity, and potentially
22 delay realization of the customer benefits intended through SB 1208.

23 Similarly, SDG&E does not recommend that the Commission treat recommendations
24 contained within the CAS Working Group's Phase II Report as Phase I enhancements through
25 this proceeding. The Commission intentionally established a phased implementation approach in
26 D.23-05-006 and directed the Working Group to develop Phase II recommendations for future

²⁷ D.23-05-006, Ordering Paragraph (OP) 6 at 33.

1 Commission consideration rather than immediate implementation. Recommendations such as
2 third-party income verification services, expanded data sharing with categorical eligibility
3 programs, CARE and FERA recertification functionality, and Post Enrollment Verification
4 (PEV) applications raise policy, governance, privacy, security, operational, and cost recovery
5 considerations that have not yet been resolved.

6 While SDG&E recognizes the potential benefits identified in the Phase II Report,
7 SDG&E believes further evaluation should occur only after Phase I implementation is complete
8 and sufficient operational experience has been obtained. This would allow the Commission and
9 stakeholders to assess actual customer utilization, online application performance, operational
10 challenges, and privacy considerations before expanding the scope of CAS.

11 Should the Commission elect to pursue future CAS enhancements, SDG&E recommends
12 that any consideration of expanded functionality first be accompanied by development of a
13 standardized statewide governance and technical control framework addressing data
14 management, privacy protections, cybersecurity requirements, auditability, accountability, cost
15 recovery, and program oversight. Following adoption of such a framework, the Commission
16 could consider limited pilot activities to evaluate proposed enhancements before broader
17 deployment.

18 Accordingly, SDG&E is not requesting additional funding associated with CAS Phase I
19 enhancements in this proceeding. Any future enhancement proposals requiring additional budget
20 should be supported by demonstrated operational need, stakeholder review, detailed
21 implementation planning, and appropriate Commission authorization.

1 **2. What data sharing initiatives could be established through CAS as an**
2 **enhancement to Phase I, or established as individual data sharing**
3 **agreements with ESA, CARE, or FERA separate from CAS? What**
4 **are the objectives and proposed use case(s) for cross-program data**
5 **sharing (income verification, lead generation, automatic enrollment,**
6 **general targeting of eligible households)? Provide a proposed plan to**
7 **implement proposed new data sharing initiatives, including next steps**
8 **and estimated cost.**

9 SDG&E is not proposing new data sharing initiatives through CAS as an enhancement to
10 Phase I at this time. Consistent with the Commission's phased approach to CAS, SDG&E
11 believes that broader data sharing proposals identified in the CAS Working Group's Phase II
12 Report should be evaluated through a future Commission process. Given privacy, cybersecurity,
13 governance, and operational considerations associated with expanded sharing of customer
14 eligibility and income information, SDG&E recommends that the Commission first establish a
15 statewide governance framework before considering broader CAS-based data sharing initiatives.

16 Separate from CAS, SDG&E utilizes existing data sharing agreements with the California
17 Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) and local LIHEAP service
18 agencies to support enrollment in its income-qualified programs. SDG&E proposes to continue
19 leveraging these existing partnerships to facilitate automatic enrollment of income-verified
20 LIHEAP participants into CARE or FERA based on household income and household size,
21 reducing customer burden and improving access to bill assistance programs.²⁸ SDG&E is not
22 proposing additional program-specific data sharing partnerships at this time but remains open to
23 future opportunities that can be implemented with appropriate customer protections and program
24 oversight.

25

²⁸ Ex. SDG&E-02 (CARE/FERA Direct) at 39-43.

1 **V. CORRECTIONS TO ATTACHMENT G**

2 Following submission of its application and prepared direct testimony in this proceeding,
3 SDG&E identified a few minor typographical errors in Attachment G and made the following
4 corrections. These updates are reflected in Attachment A to this Supplemental Testimony.

- 5 • Table 5 ESA Savings Budget CE, at J10 – RIM: PY 2029 RIM value updated
6 from 0.14 to 0.16.
- 7 • Table A-3 Bill Savings, F20-F23 – Per Property Average Lifecycle Bill
8 Savings: PY 2029-2031 values were updated.
- 9 • Table A-1 ESA Main Planning and Table A-1a ESA MFWB Planning,
10 Column BJ-Energy Efficiency Savings Claim Sources: Several workpaper
11 references and related notes were updated.

12 Additionally, on July 8, 2026, the Commission issued Decision D.26-07-007, which
13 approved the IOUs' budgets for the 2027 IQP bridge period. Because the decision was issued
14 after SDG&E finalized this filing, SDG&E was unable to incorporate the approved 2027 budget
15 figures into the tables reflected in Attachment A and Attachment B. Accordingly, the attached
16 tables continue to reflect SDG&E's proposed 2027 budget rather than the budget adopted in
17 D.26-07-007.

18 This concludes my prepared supplemental testimony

1 **VI. WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS**

2 My name is Kazeem Omidiji. I am the Director of Customer Programs at SDG&E. My
3 business address is 8335 Century Park Court, San Diego, California 92123-1257. In my current
4 position, I am responsible for leading the team who manages and administers the income-
5 qualified programs, consisting of the ESA, CARE, and FERA programs for SDG&E. The
6 purpose of my direct testimony is to sponsor and testify to SDG&E's PY 2028-2033 policy
7 change recommendations for the ESA, CARE, and FERA programs. I hold a Bachelor of
8 Science in Electrical Engineering from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I joined SDG&E in
9 2010 as an Engineering Intern. Since then, I have held different positions with different levels of
10 responsibility including Associate Engineer, Account Executive, Project Manager, and
11 Regulatory Case Manager. In 2021, I served as Director of Community Relations. In August
12 2025, I was named Director of Customer Programs. I have been in my present position for
13 eleven months. I have not previously testified before this Commission.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

**ATTACHMENT A
ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE, CALIFORNIA ALTERNATE RATES FOR ENERGY,
FAMILY ENERGY RATE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PLANS
AND BUDGETS FOR PROGRAM YEARS 2028-2033
(UPDATED)**

Company Name	San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Company Acronym	SDG&E
Grey Cells	Do not enter data in the grey cells. The values are pulled from detailed program tables or the sum function is built in.
Colored Tabs	
	Summary Tables
	ESA Planning Assumptions
	EM&V Studies
	CARE Budget Goals
	FERA Budget & Goals
	Rate Impacts
Tabs:	
Tables 1-2 CARE Enr Budget	
Tables 3-4 FERA Enr Budget	
Tables 5 ESA Savings Budget CE	
Table 6 ESA HH Treatment Target	
Table 7 ESA Budget by Category	
Table 8 CAS Budget	
A-1 ESA Main Planning	
A-1a ESA MFWB	
A-1b ESA Pilot	
A-2 ESA Housing Type	
A-3 ESA Bill Savings	
A-4 Studies Budget	
B-1 CARE Budget Details	
B-2 CARE Enrollment	
C-1 FERA Budget Details	
C-2 FERA Enrollment	
D-1 Rate Impacts- Gas	
D-2 Rate Impacts-Electric	
End of Tables	

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 1: CARE Participation and Enrollment Percentage Goals

CARE Goals	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033
Participation/ Enrollment Goal	90%	90%	96.0%	95.0%	93.0%	92.0%	91.0%	90.0%

Table 2: CARE Proposed Budgets (Total Gas and Electric)

Categories	Approved 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033	Total (2028-2033)
CARE Administrative Budget	\$ 7,401,649	\$ 7,401,649	\$ 7,711,323	\$ 7,965,911	\$ 8,034,643	\$ 8,317,714	\$ 8,416,425	\$ 8,703,733	\$ 49,149,749
CARE Discount Budget	\$ 126,524,206	\$ 218,878,622	\$ 213,416,309	\$ 215,550,473	\$ 217,705,977	\$ 219,883,037	\$ 222,081,867	\$ 224,302,686	\$ 1,312,940,350
CARE Administrative + Discount Budget	\$ 133,925,855	\$ 226,280,271	\$ 221,127,632	\$ 223,516,383	\$ 225,740,621	\$ 228,200,751	\$ 230,498,292	\$ 233,006,420	\$ 1,362,090,099

Table 2a: CARE Proposed Budgets (Electric)

Categories	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	Total (2028-2033)
CARE Administrative Budget	\$ 6,661,484	\$ 6,735,500	\$ 6,940,190	\$ 7,169,320	\$ 7,231,179	\$ 7,485,943	\$ 7,574,782	\$ 7,833,360	\$ 44,234,774
CARE Discount Budget	\$ 113,871,785	\$ 199,179,546	\$ 192,074,678	\$ 193,995,425	\$ 195,935,380	\$ 197,894,733	\$ 199,873,681	\$ 201,872,417	\$ 1,181,646,315
CARE Administrative + Discount Budget	\$ 120,533,270	\$ 205,915,046	\$ 199,014,869	\$ 201,164,745	\$ 203,166,558	\$ 205,380,676	\$ 207,448,463	\$ 209,705,778	\$ 1,225,881,089

Table 2b: CARE Proposed Budgets (Gas)

Categories	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	Total (2028-2033)
CARE Administrative Budget	\$ 740,165	\$ 666,148	\$ 771,132	\$ 796,591	\$ 803,464	\$ 831,771	\$ 841,642	\$ 870,373	\$ 4,914,975
CARE Discount Budget	\$ 12,652,421	\$ 19,699,076	\$ 21,341,631	\$ 21,555,047	\$ 21,770,598	\$ 21,988,304	\$ 22,208,187	\$ 22,430,269	\$ 131,294,035
CARE Administrative + Discount Budget	\$ 13,392,586	\$ 20,365,224	\$ 22,112,763	\$ 22,351,638	\$ 22,574,062	\$ 22,820,075	\$ 23,049,829	\$ 23,300,642	\$ 136,209,010

Note:

Tables 2a and 2b are for Gas & Electric IOUs	Electric Percentage	Gas Percentage
Electric and Gas allocation (PY 2028-2033)	90%	10%
Electric and Gas allocation (PY 2027)	91%	9%
Electric and Gas allocation (PY 2026)	90%	10%

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 3: FERA Participation and Enrollment Percentage Goals

FERA	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033
Participation/ Enrollment Goal	70%	70%	47.5%	52.5%	57.5%	62.5%	67.0%	70.0%

Table 4: FERA Proposed Budgets

Categories	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033	Total 2028-2031
FERA Administrative Budget	\$ 640,368	\$ 984,185	\$ 1,979,370	\$ 1,992,889	\$ 2,017,310	\$ 2,052,553	\$ 2,074,158	\$ 2,100,782	\$ 12,217,062
FERA Discount Budget	\$ 5,388,762	\$ 5,449,903	\$ 11,254,869	\$ 12,439,592	\$ 13,624,315	\$ 14,809,038	\$ 15,875,288	\$ 16,586,122	\$ 84,589,223
FERA Administrative + Discount Budget	\$ 6,029,130	\$ 6,434,088	\$ 13,234,239	\$ 14,432,480	\$ 15,641,625	\$ 16,861,590	\$ 17,949,446	\$ 18,686,905	\$ 96,806,285

Note:
FERA is 100% electric. N/A for gas.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 5: ESA Annual Energy Savings Goals (kWh, kW, Therms) Budget, Cost Effectiveness Tests [13]

Table 5a: ESA Portfolio (ESA MAIN, MFWB, other new program)

Category	kWh	kW	Therms	Budget	Energy Savings Assistance Cost Effectiveness Test (ESACET)	Resource Test [1]	TRC [2]	PAC [2]	RIM [2]	SCB (Base) [3]	SCB (High) [3]
PY 2026, Updated in A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony [4]	3,282,219	394	182,359	\$ 29,755,102	0.28	0.33	0.20	0.20	0.14	0.27	0.28
Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony)	3,939,709	641	247,731	\$ 35,741,017	0.27	0.31	0.16	0.16	0.11	0.21	0.22
PY 2028	2,049,417	572	160,085	\$ 26,864,081	0.37	0.33	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.24	0.24
PY 2029	2,481,710	705	204,983	\$ 32,007,446	0.40	0.37	0.19	0.20	0.16	0.27	0.27
PY 2030	2,480,163	706	201,691	\$ 32,972,541	0.40	0.37	0.20	0.20	0.16	0.27	0.27
PY 2031	2,493,055	707	205,740	\$ 33,863,867	0.40	0.38	0.20	0.20	0.17	0.28	0.28
PY 2032	2,501,741	709	206,178	\$ 34,909,103	0.41	0.38	0.20	0.20	0.17	0.28	0.28
PY 2033	2,535,142	713	206,402	\$ 34,139,195	0.41	0.38	0.21	0.21	0.17	0.28	0.28
Total Request (2028-2033)	14,541,229	4,112	1,185,078	\$ 194,756,234							

Table 5b: ESA MAIN

Category	kWh	kW	Therms	Budget	Energy Savings Assistance Cost Effectiveness Test (ESACET)	Resource Test [1]	TRC [2]	PAC [2]	RIM [2]	SCB (Base) [3]	SCB (High) [3]
PY 2026, Updated in A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony [5]	2,008,318	286	109,161	\$ 19,832,922	0.26	0.28	0.17	0.17	0.12	0.23	0.23
Proposed PY 2027, Updated in A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony [6]	1,921,995	456	92,536	\$ 22,011,220	0.25	0.26	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.17	0.18
PY 2028	1,412,994	464	105,223	\$ 20,379,166	0.36	0.27	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.21	0.22
PY 2029	1,418,646	465	105,644	\$ 21,139,444	0.36	0.28	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.22	0.22
PY 2030	1,424,320	467	106,067	\$ 21,851,074	0.37	0.28	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.22	0.22
PY 2031	1,430,017	469	106,491	\$ 22,474,158	0.37	0.29	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.22	0.22
PY 2032	1,435,738	471	106,917	\$ 23,085,978	0.37	0.29	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.22	0.22
PY 2033	1,440,045	472	107,238	\$ 23,734,942	0.38	0.29	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.22	0.22
Total Request (2028-2033)	8,561,760	2,809	637,580	\$ 132,664,762							

Table 5c: ESA MFWB and SPOC

Category	kWh	kW	Therms	Budget	Energy Savings Assistance Cost Effectiveness Test (ESACET) [5]	Resource Test [1]	TRC [2]	PAC [2]	RIM [2]	SCB (Base) [3]	SCB (High) [3]
PY 2026, Updated in A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony [7]	1,273,901	109	73,198	\$ 8,395,497	0.32	0.44	0.27	0.28	0.16	0.38	0.39
Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony) [8]	2,017,714	185	155,195	\$ 11,938,738	0.31	0.38	0.21	0.22	0.15	0.28	0.29
PY 2028	636,423	109	54,862	\$ 6,043,887	0.42	0.53	0.24	0.24	0.22	0.33	0.33
PY 2029	1,063,064	239	99,339	\$ 9,124,395	0.47	0.60	0.29	0.29	0.24	0.39	0.39
PY 2030	1,055,843	239	95,624	\$ 9,393,265	0.47	0.60	0.28	0.29	0.24	0.39	0.39
PY 2031	1,063,038	238	99,249	\$ 9,672,437	0.48	0.61	0.29	0.30	0.25	0.40	0.40
PY 2032	1,066,003	238	99,261	\$ 9,957,826	0.49	0.62	0.30	0.30	0.25	0.41	0.41
PY 2033	1,095,097	241	99,164	\$ 10,201,843	0.50	0.62	0.30	0.31	0.25	0.41	0.42
Total Request (2028-2033)	5,979,469	1,303	547,498	\$ 54,393,653							

Table 5d: PPPD (PY 2026-2027) & Electrification Pilot (PY 2028-2033) [12]

Category	kWh	kW	Therms	Budget	Assistance Cost	Resource Test [1]	TRC [2]	PAC [2]	RIM [2]	SCB (Base) [3]	SCB (High) [3]
PY 2026 for PPPD (D.21-06-015) [9]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,526,683	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Proposed PY 2027 for PPPD (A.25-06-022) [10]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,791,059	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2028 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 441,028	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2029 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,743,607	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2030 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,728,201	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2031 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,717,273	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2032 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,865,299	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2033 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 202,411	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Request (2028-2033)	-	-	-	\$ 7,697,819	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Cost Effectiveness Notes:

- [1] - Formerly known as the Resource TRC, updated per: June 2018 Recommendations of the ESA Cost Effectiveness Working Group.
- [2] - Provided for PY2021 through PY2026 in compliance with Decision 19-05-019.
- [3] - SCT provided in compliance with D.24-07-015 OPI. There are two values for SCT: SCB or SCT Base and SCH or SCT High.
- [4] - PY 2026, ESA Portfolio CET values are from ESA Main and MFWB values revised in A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A. Energy savings and budget are aggregated from Tables 5b-5d.
- [5] - PY 2026, ESA Main CET values are from authorized SDG&E AL 3842-E/2012-G et al. effective October 1, 2021, and revised in A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A.
- [6] - PY 2027 ESA Main CET values are from A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A.
- [7] - PY 2026 MFWB CET values are from authorized SDG&E Advice Letter 4115-E/3144-G, Table 4, effective Dec 30, 2022 and revised in A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A.
- [8] - PY 2027 MFWB CET values are from A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A.
- [9] - PY 2026 PPPD Budget from D.21-06-015. No CET conducted and values are not available, per D.21-06-015 OP 38 and Attachment 2.
- [10] - PY 2027 PPPD Budget from A.25-06-022. No CET conducted and values are not available, per D.21-06-015 OP 38 and Attachment 2.
- [11] - Similar to D.21-06-015 OP 38 and Attachment 2 Guidance for Pilot Plus/Pilot Deep, no ESACET threshold was determined for new Electrification Pilot but shall be tracked during the cycle.
- [12] - Intentionally left blank - pending Commission approval and selection of implementer. Final electrification measures, quantities and savings will be determined once the Pilot implementer has been contracted.
- [13] - The CET was updated on June 26, 2026 to correct an issue affecting electric cost-effectiveness outputs associated with Avoided Cost Version 2026. However, due to the timing of the update, the expected use of a different avoided cost version for reporting actuals, and SDG&E's decision not to re-run the ESACET analysis for the four-year plan—instead removing PY 2032 and 2033—the cost-effectiveness values presented in this table are representative of the CET version approved at the time the 6-year application was submitted.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 6: Annual ESA Household Treatment Targets¹

	Household Targets	Multifamily Property Targets²
Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015 & AL 4115E-3144G)	16,065	54
Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	14,766	46
PY 2028	8,750	5
PY 2029	10,150	25
PY 2030	10,150	30
PY 2031	10,150	30
PY 2032	10,150	30
PY 2033	10,150	30
Total (2028-2033)	59,500	150

Notes:

1. The household treatment targets for PYs 2028-2033 are for the ESA Portfolio, including Main ESA, MFWB in-units, with exception of any proposed pilots.
2. Multifamily Property Targets relates to whole building projects.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 7: ESA Portfolio Budget by Category (Show Full Budget Amount)

ESA Program Budget Categories	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015, AL 4115E-3144G & AL 4482-3324G) ⁴	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033	Total Request (2028-2033)
EE Budget¹									
EE Main	\$ 17,214,498	\$ 17,214,377	\$ 15,420,693	\$ 15,975,679	\$ 16,477,562	\$ 16,986,067	\$ 17,510,643	\$ 18,037,254	\$ 100,407,898
EE-Pilots ⁵	\$ 1,526,683	\$ 1,791,059	\$ 211,020	\$ 1,402,442	\$ 1,402,442	\$ 1,394,942	\$ 1,376,098	\$ -	\$ 5,786,944
EE-MF	\$ 8,394,059	\$ 10,726,978	\$ 4,243,266	\$ 7,270,689	\$ 7,488,155	\$ 7,714,366	\$ 7,945,203	\$ 8,179,704	\$ 42,841,383
EE Subtotal	\$ 27,135,240	\$ 29,732,414	\$ 19,874,979	\$ 24,648,810	\$ 25,368,159	\$ 26,095,375	\$ 26,831,944	\$ 26,216,958	\$ 149,036,225
Administrative²									
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 308,400	\$ 213,045	\$ 282,180	\$ 288,700	\$ 299,363	\$ 306,600	\$ 315,472	\$ 327,123	\$ 1,819,438
General Administration	\$ 3,347,835	\$ 3,205,773	\$ 1,907,973	\$ 2,713,967	\$ 2,744,013	\$ 2,873,426	\$ 2,955,474	\$ 2,941,129	\$ 16,135,982
Administrative Subtotal	\$ 3,656,235	\$ 3,418,818	\$ 2,190,153	\$ 3,002,667	\$ 3,043,376	\$ 3,180,026	\$ 3,270,946	\$ 3,268,252	\$ 17,955,420
Direct Implementation (DI)²									
Training Center	\$ 160,614	\$ 160,614	\$ 75,000	\$ 77,250	\$ 79,568	\$ 81,955	\$ 84,413	\$ 86,946	\$ 485,132
Workforce Education and Training	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Inspections	\$ 110,062	\$ 226,923	\$ 224,839	\$ 240,829	\$ 248,054	\$ 268,479	\$ 263,161	\$ 260,650	\$ 1,506,012
EE-MF - SPOC	\$ 651,613	\$ 462,333	\$ 190,007	\$ 188,548	\$ 202,454	\$ 201,476	\$ 200,619	\$ 182,337	\$ 1,165,441
Other DI Costs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,694,021	\$ 2,182,934	\$ 2,242,339	\$ 2,292,312	\$ 2,450,141	\$ 2,415,423	\$ 14,277,170
Marketing and Outreach²	\$ 1,674,124	\$ 1,630,135	\$ 1,554,108	\$ 1,566,714	\$ 1,598,901	\$ 1,590,787	\$ 1,671,879	\$ 1,622,559	\$ 9,604,948
EM&V²									
Studies ³	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 37,500	\$ 126,250	\$ 88,750	\$ 70,000	\$ 18,750	\$ 341,250
CPUC Energy Division	\$ 59,780	\$ 59,780	\$ 60,975	\$ 62,194	\$ 63,438	\$ 64,707	\$ 66,000	\$ 67,321	\$ 384,635
DI + Marketing & Outreach + EM&V Subtotal	\$ 2,706,193	\$ 2,589,785	\$ 4,798,950	\$ 4,355,969	\$ 4,561,004	\$ 4,588,466	\$ 4,806,213	\$ 4,653,986	\$ 27,764,588
Portfolio Total	\$ 33,497,668	\$ 35,741,017	\$ 26,864,081	\$ 32,007,446	\$ 32,972,541	\$ 33,863,867	\$ 34,909,103	\$ 34,139,195	\$ 194,756,234
Percentage of Administrative Costs (Admin/Total Portfolio)	10.9%	9.6%	8.2%	9.4%	9.2%	9.4%	9.4%	9.6%	9.2%

Notes:

- 1 - EE Budget includes measure (equipment) cost + implementer/subcontractor administration, outreach/education training, and installation cost (if outsourced). See Table A-1 and A-1a for details.
- 2 - These cost categories conform to the definition of costs as used by Energy Efficiency programs and defined in Appendix C of the EE Policy Manual V2, April 2020. See D.21-06-015, OP 112. (ex. Engineering, Reporting).
- 3 - Study budget is the IOU Portion of Statewide Studies Budget from Tab A-4 Studies Budget.
- 4 - MFWE program budget per SDG&E Advice Letter 4115-E/3144-G, Table 4 and SDG&E's administrative costs as outlined in AL 4482-E/3324-G, Table 1. These amounts differs than the forecasted amount filed in the PY 2027 A.25-06-022.
- 5 - Staff Proposal Pilot (PPP) is leveraged for 2026 and 2027.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
 Table 8: Concurrent Application System (CAS) Budget

CAS Budget Categories	PY 2025 [1]	PY 2026 [1]	PY 2027 [1]	PY 2028 [2]	PY 2029 [2]	PY 2030 [3]	PY 2031 [3]	PY 2032 [3]	PY 2033 [3]	Total PYs 2028-2033
Joint IOU Third Party Contract	\$ 607,650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 69,000	\$ 71,000	\$ 73,000	\$ 408,000
SDG&E IT/Programming, Administrative Costs	\$ 2,142,000	\$ 914,000	\$ 481,000	\$ 311,000	\$ 249,000	\$ 256,470	\$ 264,164	\$ 272,089	\$ 280,252	\$ 1,632,975
Total	\$ 2,749,650	\$ 914,000	\$ 481,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 314,000	\$ 323,470	\$ 333,164	\$ 343,089	\$ 353,252	\$ 2,040,975

Notes:
 [1] - Resolution E-5394, OP 2 approved the \$4,051,000 CAS Phase 1 development budget from 2025 to 2027 and SDG&E's 15% cost share as requested in AL 4543-E/3365-G - \$4,051,000 X 15% = \$607,650.
 OP 3 approved SDG&E's \$3,621,692 IT/administrative budget that covers PYs 2024-2027 as requested in AL 4543-E/3365-G.
 [2] - Resolution E-5394 directs program year 2028 and 2029 to be included in the this application for approval.
 [3] - Forecasted costs for IOU maintenance, assumes +3% annual escalation in Program Years 2030-2033.

Revenue Category	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
Operating Revenue	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Operating Expenses & Other	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Administrative Expenses	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Other	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

Attachment A - 11

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table A-2: Projected Participants by Housing Type

Projected Customers Treated		Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015 & AL 4115E-3144G)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033
Gas and Electric Customers									
	Single Family	2,660	2,883	2,588	2,588	2,588	2,588	2,588	2,588
	Multifamily	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mobile Homes	590	640	575	575	575	575	575	575
Owners - Total		3,250	3,523	3,163	3,163	3,163	3,163	3,163	3,163
	Single Family	2,660	2,883	2,512	2,512	2,512	2,512	2,512	2,512
	Multifamily	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mobile Homes	-	-	75	75	75	75	75	75
Renters - Total		2,660	2,883	2,587	2,587	2,587	2,587	2,587	2,587
MFWB Customers									
	Properties	54	46	5	25	30	30	30	30
	Multifamily Tenant Units	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Units Indirectly Treated (CAM)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Owners - Total		54	46	5	25	30	30	30	30
	Properties	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Multifamily Tenant Units	10,155	8,360	3,000	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400
	Units Indirectly Treated (CAM)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Renters - Total		10,155	8,360	3,000	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400

* Multifamily is defined as 5 or more units as proposed in this Application.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Table A-3 ESA Bill Savings

ESA Table A-3a				
Bill Savings Calculations by Program Year (ESA Main - SF, MH)				
Program Year	Program Costs	Program Lifecycle Bill Savings	Program Bill Savings/ Cost Ratio	Per Home Average Lifecycle Bill Savings
2028	\$ 20,379,166	\$ 8,582,972	0.4212	\$ 1,493
2029	\$ 21,139,444	\$ 8,631,512	0.4083	\$ 1,501
2030	\$ 21,851,074	\$ 8,671,351	0.3968	\$ 1,508
2031	\$ 22,474,158	\$ 8,711,272	0.3876	\$ 1,515
2032	\$ 23,085,978	\$ 8,751,503	0.3791	\$ 1,522
2033	\$ 23,734,942	\$ 8,779,197	0.3699	\$ 1,527

ESA Table A-3b					
Bill Savings Calculations by Program Year - MFWB (In-Unit and CAM)					
Program Year	Program Costs	Program Lifecycle Bill Savings	Program Bill Savings/ Cost Ratio	Per In-Unit Average Lifecycle Bill Savings	Per Property Average Lifecycle Bill Savings
2028	\$ 6,043,887	\$ 3,750,796	0.6206	\$ 1,038	\$ 127,431
2029	\$ 9,124,395	\$ 6,220,808	0.6818	\$ 1,122	\$ 51,287
2030	\$ 9,393,265	\$ 6,107,543	0.6502	\$ 1,110	\$ 40,809
2031	\$ 9,672,437	\$ 6,229,188	0.6440	\$ 1,124	\$ 42,829
2032	\$ 9,957,826	\$ 6,245,028	0.6271	\$ 1,126	\$ 42,999
2033	\$ 10,201,843	\$ 6,380,779	0.6255	\$ 1,136	\$ 46,056

ESA Table A-3c				
Bill Savings Calculations by Program Year (Electrification Pilot)				
Intentionally left blank - pending Commission approval and selection of implementer.				
Program Year	Program Costs	Program Lifecycle Bill Savings	Program Bill Savings/ Cost Ratio	Per Home Average Lifecycle Bill Savings
2028	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -
2029	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -
2030	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -
2031	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -
2032	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -
2033	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Table A-4: ESA and CARE Studies Budget

	Proposed Timelines and Budgets for Future Studies & Evaluation															
	ESA						CARE									
	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	[1] ESA Funded Total	[2] CARE Funded Total	SDGE Total	All IOUs Proposed Budget
Studies ^[1]																
2031 Low Income Needs Assessments ^[2]			\$ 18,750	\$ 18,750					\$ 18,750	\$ 18,750			\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 75,000	\$ 500,000
2034 Low Income Needs Assessments ^[2]						\$ 18,750						\$ 18,750	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 75,000	\$ 500,000
Impact Evaluations (2 studies): ESA Main and MFWB ^[3]			\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000										\$ 210,000	\$ 1,400,000
Non-Energy Benefits Study + Tool Update ^[4]		\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500										\$ 75,000		\$ 75,000	\$ 500,000
SDG&E Portion (15%) for Statewide Studies ^[5]	\$ 37,500	\$ 126,250	\$ 88,750	\$ 70,000	\$ 18,750				\$ 18,750	\$ 18,750		\$ 18,750	\$ 150,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 435,000	
Evolving Study and Data Needs Budgets (Each IOU) ^[6]	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000				\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000			\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,350,000
Total ^[7]															\$ 735,000	\$ 4,250,000

Notes:
Table A-4 does not include FERA funded studies such as the joint IOU annual estimates of customers eligible for CARE and FERA programs.

Assumptions:
[1] Statewide Low-Income EM&V study budget payments are allocated as: 30% PG&E, 30% SCE, 25% SoCal Gas and SDG&E 15%.
[2] For the 2031 and 2034 LINAs, assume spending is evenly spread across 2030 and 2031, and 2033 and 2034, respectively. The 2034 LINA total funding request is \$75,000 and will cross program years similar to the 2028 LINA study approved in D.21-06-015 (OP 167), with authorized committed funding to be carried forward into the next cycle. LINA studies are funded 50/50 via ESA and CARE budgets. The 2028 LINA will be conducted during PYs 2027 and 2028.
[3] For Impact Evaluations, assume program ramp-up will take place in 2028, and 2029 would be the representative year for program data analyses.
[4] For Non-Energy-Benefits Study, assume spending is evenly spread across program years 2029 and 2030.
[5] These values excludes the Evolving Study and Data Needs budget amounts.
[6] Evolving Study and Data Needs budget is not a statewide study. PG&E, SoCalGas, and SCE are each requesting \$350,000 and SDG&E is requesting \$300,000. Assumes spending is spread across program years 2029, 2030, and 2031.
[7] The Total (row 14) is the sum of all IOU proposed statewide study budgets and the evolving needs budget for all IOUs.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Table B-1: CARE Program Budget

CARE Budget Categories	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033	Total PYs 2028-2033
Outreach	\$ 3,501,185	\$ 2,519,823	\$ 2,716,798	\$ 2,744,039	\$ 2,771,829	\$ 2,800,180	\$ 2,829,107	\$ 2,858,621	\$ 16,720,573
Processing, Certification, Recertification	\$ 687,401	\$ 1,635,357	\$ 1,953,865	\$ 2,032,196	\$ 2,113,666	\$ 2,198,400	\$ 2,286,529	\$ 2,378,943	\$ 12,963,599
Post Enrollment Verification	\$ 533,984	\$ 533,984	\$ 358,757	\$ 372,051	\$ 385,845	\$ 400,157	\$ 415,009	\$ 429,666	\$ 2,361,485
Enrollment and Reenrollment Verification (SCE Only)									\$ -
IT Programming	\$ 1,202,602	\$ 1,202,602	\$ 1,318,617	\$ 1,333,531	\$ 1,348,892	\$ 1,364,715	\$ 1,381,012	\$ 1,397,798	\$ 8,144,564
Studies & Pilots	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,625	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 38,625	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 197,250
Measurement & Evaluation	\$ 21,538	\$ 21,538	\$ 84,316	\$ 85,495	\$ 86,710	\$ 87,961	\$ 89,250	\$ 90,577	\$ 524,309
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 347,761	\$ 358,194	\$ 350,125	\$ 359,876	\$ 369,920	\$ 380,265	\$ 417,890	\$ 429,674	\$ 2,307,750
General Administration	\$ 765,768	\$ 788,741	\$ 546,519	\$ 662,660	\$ 579,286	\$ 696,411	\$ 614,049	\$ 732,216	\$ 3,831,140
CPUC									\$ -
Energy Division Staff	\$ 76,410	\$ 76,410	\$ 78,702	\$ 81,063	\$ 83,495	\$ 86,000	\$ 88,580	\$ 91,238	\$ 509,079
CHANGE ¹	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 1,590,000
SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	\$ 7,401,649	\$ 7,401,649	\$ 7,711,323	\$ 7,965,911	\$ 8,034,643	\$ 8,317,714	\$ 8,416,425	\$ 8,703,733	\$ 49,149,749
CARE Discount Budget ²	\$ 126,524,206	\$ 218,878,622	\$ 213,416,309	\$ 215,550,473	\$ 217,705,977	\$ 219,883,037	\$ 222,081,867	\$ 224,302,686	\$ 1,312,940,350
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS & CUSTOMER DISCOUNTS	\$ 133,925,855	\$ 226,280,271	\$ 221,127,632	\$ 223,516,383	\$ 225,740,621	\$ 228,200,751	\$ 230,498,292	\$ 233,006,420	\$ 1,362,090,099

Notes:

1 - CHANGES is managed by the Commission's Consumers Affairs Branch and Energy Division staff.

2 - CARE Discount is based on 2026 CARE PPP forecast in AL 4717-E filed 9/30/25 and AL 3462-G filed 10/31/25 +1% per year, an accepted annual forecasting methodology.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Table B-2: 2028-2033 CARE Enrollment/Participation

	Total Enrolled 12-31-24	Total Enrolled Through August 2025	Estimated PY2025 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY2025 Participation	Estimated PY 2025 Enrollment Rate (a)	Estimated PY2026 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY2026 Participation	Estimated PY 2026 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2025 to 2026	Estimated PY2027 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2027 Participation	Estimated PY 2027 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2026 to 2027
(Source)	(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)		(3)	(4)			(3)	(4)	
	305,902	291,660	-7,800	298,102	104%	-7,800	290,302	101%	-3%	-7,800	282,502	98%	-3%

Estimated PY 2028 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2028 Participation	Estimated PY 2028 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2027 to 2028	Estimated PY 2029 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2029 Participation	Estimated PY 2029 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2028 to 2029	Estimated PY 2030 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2030 Participation	Estimated PY 2030 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2029 to 2030
(4)		(4)				(4)				(4)	
-5,000	277,502	96%	-2%	-4,500	273,002	95%	-2%	-4,000	269,002	93%	-1%

Estimated PY 2031 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2031 Participation	Estimated PY 2031 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2030 to 2031	Estimated PY 2032 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2032 Participation	Estimated PY 2032 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2031 to 2032	Estimated PY 2033 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2033 Participation	Estimated PY 2033 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2032 to 2033
(4)		(4)				(4)				(4)	
-3,500	265,502	92%	-1%	-3,000	262,502	91%	-1%	-2,500	260,002	90%	-1%

Notes:

- (a) Estimated CARE Enrollment Rate will fluctuate based on updated CARE Eligibility information
- (1) CARE 2024 Annual Report dated June 27, 2025
- (2) CARE Net Enrollment as of SDG&E's August 2025 Low Income Monthly Report dated September 22, 2025
- (3) Based on most recent estimates from 2025 enrollments, eligibility factors
- (4) Assumes maintaining or exceeding program goal of 90% enrollment

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Table C-1: FERA Program Budget

FERA Budget Categories	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	PY 2032	PY 2033	Total PYs 2028-2033
Outreach	\$ 375,741	\$ 625,741	\$ 1,062,396	\$ 1,072,721	\$ 1,083,245	\$ 1,093,872	\$ 1,104,809	\$ 1,116,060	\$ 6,533,102
Processing, Certification, Recertification	\$ 15,061	\$ 71,115	\$ 24,703	\$ 25,444	\$ 26,208	\$ 26,994	\$ 27,804	\$ 28,638	\$ 159,791
Post Enrollment Verification	\$ 1,122	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,773	\$ 36,846	\$ 37,952	\$ 39,090	\$ 40,263	\$ 41,471	\$ 231,394
Enrollment and Reenrollment Verification (SCE Only)									\$ -
IT Programming	\$ 57,963	\$ 57,963	\$ 576,160	\$ 582,045	\$ 588,106	\$ 594,349	\$ 600,780	\$ 607,403	\$ 3,548,843
Studies & Pilots	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,900	\$ 30,900	\$ 30,900	\$ 30,900	\$ 30,900	\$ 30,900	\$ 185,400
Measurement & Evaluation	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 55,450	\$ 45,305	\$ 45,464	\$ 55,928	\$ 45,796	\$ 45,970	\$ 293,912
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 48,860	\$ 50,326	\$ 84,491	\$ 86,849	\$ 89,277	\$ 91,778	\$ 100,578	\$ 103,419	\$ 556,391
General Administration	\$ 80,160	\$ 82,579	\$ 97,692	\$ 100,620	\$ 103,636	\$ 106,742	\$ 109,942	\$ 113,237	\$ 631,869
CPUC Energy Division Staff	\$ 11,461	\$ 11,461	\$ 11,805	\$ 12,159	\$ 12,524	\$ 12,899	\$ 13,286	\$ 13,685	\$ 76,358
Subtotal Administrative Costs	\$ 640,368	\$ 984,185	\$ 1,979,370	\$ 1,992,889	\$ 2,017,310	\$ 2,052,553	\$ 2,074,158	\$ 2,100,782	\$ 12,217,062
FERA Discount Budget	\$ 5,388,762	\$ 5,449,903	\$ 11,254,869	\$ 12,439,592	\$ 13,624,315	\$ 14,809,038	\$ 15,875,288	\$ 16,586,122	\$ 84,589,223
Total Program Costs & Customer Discounts	\$ 6,029,130	\$ 6,434,088	\$ 13,234,239	\$ 14,432,480	\$ 15,641,625	\$ 16,861,590	\$ 17,949,446	\$ 18,686,905	\$ 96,806,285

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Table C-2 2028-2033 FERA Enrollment/Participation

	Total Enrolled 12-31-24	Total Enrolled Through August 2025	Estimated PY2025 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY2025 Participation	Estimated PY 2025 Enrollment Rate (a)	Estimated PY2026 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY2026 Participation	Estimated PY 2026 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2025 to 2026	Estimated PY2027 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2027 Participation	Estimated PY 2027 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2026 to 2027
(Source)	(1)		(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)		(2)	(2)	(2)	
	12,768	16,953	7,200	19,968	25%	7,075	27,043	33%	35%	7,075	34,118	42%	26%

Estimated PY 2028 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2028 Participation	Estimated PY 2028 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2027 to 2028	Estimated PY 2029 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2029 Participation	Estimated PY 2029 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2028 to 2029	Estimated PY 2030 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2030 Participation	Estimated PY 2030 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2029 to 2030
(3a)	(4)				(3a)	(4)			(3a)	(4)	
4,366	38,484	47.5%	13%	4,051	42,535	52.5%	11%	4,051	46,586	57.5%	10%

Estimated PY 2031 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2031 Participation	Estimated PY 2031 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2030 to 2031	Estimated PY 2032 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2032 Participation	Estimated PY 2032 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2031 to 2032	Estimated PY 2033 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2033 Participation	Estimated PY 2033 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2032 to 2033
(3a)	(4)				(3a)	(4)			(3a)	(4)	
4,051	50,637	62.5%	9%	3,646	54,283	67%	7%	2,431	56,713	70%	4%

Notes:

- (a) Estimated Goal Rate will fluctuate based on updated FERA Eligibility information.
- (1) FERA 2024 Annual Report dated March 2, 2025.
- (2) Prepared Testimony of Roland Mollen on behalf of SDG&E ERRATA August 28, 2025 Table D-2 at SDG&E - 15.
- (3) Based on most recent estimates from 2025 enrollments, eligibility factors.
- (4) Assumes 70% enrollment goal.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Table D-1: CARE/ESA/CAS Gas Rate Impacts^[1]

Category ^[2] 2028	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[4]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[5]
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04990	0.04688	0.00169	0.04701	0.00417	NA	0.09975	0.14965
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.04701	0.00417	NA	0.05118	0.10108
Commercial ^[6]	0.16061	0.04688	0.00169	0.01368	0.00121	NA	0.06346	0.22407
Industrial ^[7]	0.15595	0.04688	0.00169	0.00363	0.00032	NA	0.05252	0.20847
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
System	0.08946	0.04688	0.00169	0.03025	0.00268	NA	0.08151	0.17097

Category ^[2] 2029	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[4]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[5]
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04984	0.04739	0.00175	0.05525	0.00572	NA	0.11010	0.15994
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.05525	0.00572	NA	0.06096	0.11086
Commercial ^[6]	0.16055	0.04739	0.00175	0.01608	0.00166	NA	0.06688	0.22743
Industrial ^[7]	0.15589	0.04739	0.00175	0.00426	0.00044	NA	0.05384	0.20973
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
System	0.08936	0.04739	0.00175	0.03555	0.00368	NA	0.08837	0.17773

Category ^[2] 2030	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[4]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[5]
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04983	0.04788	0.00176	0.05701	0.00580	NA	0.11245	0.16227
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.05701	0.00580	NA	0.06281	0.11270
Commercial ^[6]	0.16054	0.04788	0.00176	0.01659	0.00169	NA	0.06792	0.22845
Industrial ^[7]	0.15588	0.04788	0.00176	0.00440	0.00045	NA	0.05448	0.21036
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
System	0.08930	0.04788	0.00176	0.03669	0.00373	NA	0.09006	0.17936

Category ^[2] 2031	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[4]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[5]
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04976	0.04842	0.00183	0.05845	0.00606	NA	0.11475	0.16451
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.05845	0.00606	NA	0.06450	0.11440
Commercial ^[6]	0.16047	0.04842	0.00183	0.01701	0.00176	NA	0.06901	0.22949
Industrial ^[7]	0.15582	0.04842	0.00183	0.00451	0.00047	NA	0.05522	0.21103
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
System	0.08919	0.04842	0.00183	0.03761	0.00390	NA	0.09175	0.18095

Category ^[2] 2032	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[4]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[5]
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04974	0.04892	0.00185	0.06026	0.00623	NA	0.11726	0.16701
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.06026	0.00623	NA	0.06649	0.11639
Commercial ^[6]	0.16045	0.04892	0.00185	0.01754	0.00181	NA	0.07012	0.23057
Industrial ^[7]	0.15579	0.04892	0.00185	0.00465	0.00048	NA	0.05590	0.21169
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
System	0.08913	0.04892	0.00185	0.03878	0.00401	NA	0.09356	0.18269

Category ^[2] 2033	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[4]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[5]
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04968	0.04947	0.00191	0.05881	0.00622	NA	0.11641	0.16609
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.05881	0.00622	NA	0.06503	0.11493
Commercial ^[6]	0.16039	0.04947	0.00191	0.01711	0.00181	NA	0.07031	0.23070
Industrial ^[7]	0.15573	0.04947	0.00191	0.00454	0.00048	NA	0.05640	0.21213
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00000	NA
System	0.08902	0.04947	0.00191	0.03784	0.00400	NA	0.09323	0.18225

Notes:
 [1] The table above is based off of January 1, 2026 Public Purpose Program Surcharge rates.
 [2] Category types will vary across IOUs.
 [3] GAS CAS revenue requirement is part of transportation rates and not part of Public Purpose Surcharge Rate. Bundled rates include CAS revenue requirement.
 [4] Core C/I- Core Commercial and Industrial Customers generally use smaller quantities of gas, and the utility purchases their gas.
 [5] Noncore C/I-Non-Core Commercial and Industrial Customers are generally large gas users who purchase their own natural gas supplies for SoCalGas to transport.
 Note: Associated balancing account amortizations are excluded from projected rate impacts.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Table D-2: CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Electric Rate Impacts ^[1]

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2028										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.355	1.085	0.039	0.064	0.011	0.050	0.004	0.001	1.254	48.609
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.507	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.050	0.004	0.001	0.055	28.562
Small Commercial	38.062	1.085	0.039	0.064	0.011	0.050	0.004	0.001	1.254	39.316
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.967	1.085	0.039	0.064	0.011	0.050	0.004	0.001	1.254	38.221
Agriculture	26.177	1.085	0.039	0.064	0.011	0.050	0.004	0.001	1.254	27.431
Lighting	34.936	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.936
System	38.110	1.085	0.039	0.064	0.011	0.050	0.004	0.001	1.254	39.364

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2029										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.357	1.096	0.040	0.070	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.283	48.640
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.527	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.059	0.006	0.001	0.066	28.593
Small Commercial	38.064	1.096	0.040	0.070	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.283	39.347
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.968	1.096	0.040	0.070	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.283	38.251
Agriculture	26.178	1.096	0.040	0.070	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.283	27.461
Lighting	34.938	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.938
System	38.110	1.096	0.040	0.070	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.283	39.393

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2030										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.358	1.107	0.041	0.077	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.304	48.662
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.546	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.061	0.006	0.001	0.068	28.614
Small Commercial	38.064	1.107	0.041	0.077	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.304	39.368
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.967	1.107	0.041	0.077	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.304	38.271
Agriculture	26.177	1.107	0.041	0.077	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.304	27.481
Lighting	34.939	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.939
System	38.110	1.107	0.041	0.077	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.304	39.414

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2031										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.358	1.118	0.042	0.084	0.012	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.326	48.684
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.567	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.063	0.006	0.001	0.070	28.637
Small Commercial	38.064	1.118	0.042	0.084	0.012	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.326	39.390
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.967	1.118	0.042	0.084	0.012	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.326	38.293
Agriculture	26.177	1.118	0.042	0.084	0.012	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.326	27.503
Lighting	34.940	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.940
System	38.110	1.118	0.042	0.084	0.012	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.326	39.436

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2032										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.359	1.129	0.043	0.090	0.012	0.065	0.007	0.001	1.347	48.706
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.585	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.065	0.007	0.001	0.073	28.658
Small Commercial	38.064	1.129	0.043	0.090	0.012	0.065	0.007	0.001	1.347	39.411
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.966	1.129	0.043	0.090	0.012	0.065	0.007	0.001	1.347	38.313
Agriculture	26.177	1.129	0.043	0.090	0.012	0.065	0.007	0.001	1.347	27.524
Lighting	34.941	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.941
System	38.110	1.129	0.043	0.090	0.012	0.065	0.007	0.001	1.347	39.457

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/ CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2033										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.363	1.140	0.044	0.094	0.012	0.063	0.007	0.001	1.361	48.724
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.604	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.063	0.007	0.001	0.071	28.675
Small Commercial	38.067	1.140	0.044	0.094	0.012	0.063	0.007	0.001	1.361	39.428
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.968	1.140	0.044	0.094	0.012	0.063	0.007	0.001	1.361	38.329
Agriculture	26.179	1.140	0.044	0.094	0.012	0.063	0.007	0.001	1.361	27.540
Lighting	34.942	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.942
System	38.112	1.140	0.044	0.094	0.012	0.063	0.007	0.001	1.361	39.473

Notes:

[1] - Rates are based on current rates effective 1/1/2026.

[2] - Category types will vary across IOUs.

[3] - Associated balancing account amortizations are excluded from projected rate impacts.

[4] - Residential Non-CARE and CARE customer types are included for illustrative purposes. Residential CARE customers are exempt from CARE/FERA discounts and administration costs.

ATTACHMENT B
ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE, CALIFORNIA ALTERNATE RATES FOR ENERGY,
FAMILY ENERGY RATE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PLANS
AND BUDGETS FOR PROGRAM YEARS 2028-2031

Company Name	San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Company Acronym	SDG&E
Grey Cells	Do not enter data in the grey cells. The values are pulled from detailed program tables or the sum function is built in.
Colored Tabs	
	Summary Tables
	ESA Planning Assumptions
	EM&V Studies
	CARE Budget Goals
	FERA Budget & Goals
	Rate Impacts
Tabs:	
Tables 1-2 CARE Enr Budget	
Tables 3-4 FERA Enr Budget	
Tables 5 ESA Savings Budget CE	
Table 6 ESA HH Treatment Target	
Table 7 ESA Budget by Category	
Table 8 CAS Budget	
A-1 ESA Main Planning	
A-1a ESA MFWB	
A-1b ESA Pilot	
A-2 ESA Housing Type	
A-3 ESA Bill Savings	
A-4 Studies Budget	
B-1 CARE Budget Details	
B-2 CARE Enrollment	
C-1 FERA Budget Details	
C-2 FERA Enrollment	
D-1 Rate Impacts- Gas	
D-2 Rate Impacts-Electric	
End of Tables	

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 1: CARE Participation and Enrollment Percentage Goals

CARE Goals	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031
Participation/ Enrollment Goal	90%	90%	96.0%	95.0%	93.0%	92.0%

Table 2: CARE Proposed Budgets (Total Gas and Electric)

Categories	Approved 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	Total (2028-2031)
CARE Administrative Budget	\$ 7,401,649	\$ 7,401,649	\$ 7,711,324	\$ 7,965,911	\$ 8,034,643	\$ 8,317,714	\$ 32,029,592
CARE Discount Budget	\$ 126,524,206	\$ 218,878,622	\$ 213,416,309	\$ 215,550,473	\$ 217,705,977	\$ 219,883,037	\$ 866,555,796
CARE Administrative + Discount Budget	\$ 133,925,855	\$ 226,280,271	\$ 221,127,633	\$ 223,516,384	\$ 225,740,620	\$ 228,200,751	\$ 898,585,388

Table 2a: CARE Proposed Budgets (Electric)

Categories	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total (2028-2031)
CARE Administrative Budget	\$ 6,661,484	\$ 6,735,500	\$ 6,940,192	\$ 7,169,320	\$ 7,231,179	\$ 7,485,943	\$ 28,826,633
CARE Discount Budget	\$ 113,871,785	\$ 199,179,546	\$ 192,074,678	\$ 193,995,426	\$ 195,935,379	\$ 197,894,733	\$ 779,900,216
CARE Administrative + Discount Budget	\$ 120,533,270	\$ 205,915,046	\$ 199,014,870	\$ 201,164,746	\$ 203,166,558	\$ 205,380,676	\$ 808,726,849

Table 2b: CARE Proposed Budgets (Gas)

Categories	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total (2028-2031)
CARE Administrative Budget	\$ 740,165	\$ 666,148	\$ 771,132	\$ 796,591	\$ 803,464	\$ 831,771	\$ 3,202,959
CARE Discount Budget	\$ 12,652,421	\$ 19,699,076	\$ 21,341,631	\$ 21,555,047	\$ 21,770,598	\$ 21,988,304	\$ 86,655,580
CARE Administrative + Discount Budget	\$ 13,392,586	\$ 20,365,224	\$ 22,112,763	\$ 22,351,638	\$ 22,574,062	\$ 22,820,075	\$ 89,858,539

Note:

Tables 2a and 2b are for Gas & Electric IOUs	Electric Percentage	Gas Percentage
Electric and Gas allocation	90%	10%
Electric and Gas allocation (PY 2027)	91%	9%
Electric and Gas allocation (PY 2026)	90%	10%

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 3: FERA Participation and Enrollment Percentage Goals

FERA	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031
Participation/ Enrollment Goal	70%	70%	47.5%	52.5%	57.5%	62.5%

Table 4: FERA Proposed Budgets

Categories	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	Total 2028-2031
FERA Administrative Budget	\$ 640,368	\$ 984,185	\$ 1,979,370	\$ 1,992,889	\$ 2,017,312	\$ 2,052,552	\$ 8,042,123
FERA Discount Budget	\$ 5,388,762	\$ 5,449,903	\$ 11,254,869	\$ 12,439,592	\$ 13,624,315	\$ 14,809,038	\$ 52,127,814
FERA Administrative + Discount Budget	\$ 6,029,130	\$ 6,434,088	\$ 13,234,239	\$ 14,432,481	\$ 15,641,627	\$ 16,861,590	\$ 60,169,937

Note:

FERA is 100% electric. N/A for gas.

Table 5: ESA Annual Energy Savings Goals (kWh, kW, Therms) Budget, Cost Effectiveness Tests [13]

Table 5a: ESA Portfolio (ESA MAIN, MFWB, other new program)

Category	kWh	kW	Therms	Budget	Energy Savings Assistance Cost Effectiveness Test (ESACET)	Resource Test [1]	TRC [2]	PAC [2]	RIM [2]	SCB (Base) [3]	SCH (High) [3]
PY 2026, Updated in A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony [4]	3,282,219	394	182,359	\$ 29,755,102	0.28	0.33	0.20	0.20	0.14	0.27	0.28
Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony)	3,939,709	641	247,731	\$ 35,741,017	0.27	0.31	0.16	0.16	0.11	0.21	0.22
PY 2028	2,049,417	572	160,085	\$ 27,599,657	0.37	0.33	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.24	0.24
PY 2029	2,481,710	705	204,983	\$ 32,292,677	0.40	0.37	0.19	0.20	0.16	0.27	0.27
PY 2030	2,480,163	706	201,691	\$ 33,333,234	0.40	0.37	0.20	0.20	0.16	0.27	0.27
PY 2031	2,493,055	707	205,740	\$ 34,618,942	0.40	0.38	0.20	0.20	0.17	0.28	0.28
Total Request (2028-2031)	9,504,346	2,690	772,498	\$ 127,844,510							

Table 5b: ESA MAIN

Category	kWh	kW	Therms	Budget	Energy Savings Assistance Cost Effectiveness Test (ESACET)	Resource Test [1]	TRC [2]	PAC [2]	RIM [2]	SCB (Base) [3]	SCH (High) [3]
PY 2026, Updated in A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony [5]	2,008,318	286	109,161	\$ 19,832,922	0.26	0.28	0.17	0.17	0.12	0.23	0.23
Proposed PY 2027, Updated in A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony [6]	1,921,995	456	92,536	\$ 22,011,220	0.25	0.26	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.17	0.18
PY 2028	1,412,994	464	105,223	\$ 20,379,166	0.36	0.27	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.21	0.22
PY 2029	1,418,646	465	105,644	\$ 21,139,444	0.36	0.28	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.22	0.22
PY 2030	1,424,320	467	106,067	\$ 21,851,074	0.37	0.28	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.22	0.22
PY 2031	1,430,017	469	106,491	\$ 22,544,158	0.37	0.29	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.22	0.22
Total Request (2028-2031)	5,685,977	1,865	423,425	\$ 85,913,842							

Table 5c: ESA MFWB and SPOC

Category	kWh	kW	Therms	Budget	Energy Savings Assistance Cost Effectiveness Test (ESACET)	Resource Test [1]	TRC [2]	PAC [2]	RIM [2]	SCB (Base) [3]	SCH (High) [3]
PY 2026, Updated in A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony [7]	1,273,901	109	73,198	\$ 8,395,497	0.32	0.44	0.27	0.28	0.16	0.38	0.39
Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022, Supplemental Testimony) [8]	2,017,714	185	155,195	\$ 11,938,738	0.31	0.38	0.21	0.22	0.15	0.28	0.29
PY 2028	636,423	109	54,862	\$ 6,043,887	0.42	0.53	0.24	0.24	0.22	0.33	0.33
PY 2029	1,063,064	239	99,339	\$ 9,124,395	0.47	0.60	0.29	0.29	0.24	0.39	0.39
PY 2030	1,055,843	239	95,624	\$ 9,393,265	0.47	0.60	0.28	0.29	0.24	0.39	0.39
PY 2031	1,063,038	238	99,249	\$ 9,672,437	0.48	0.61	0.29	0.30	0.25	0.40	0.40
Total Request (2028-2031)	3,818,369	825	349,073	\$ 34,233,984							

NOTE: IF THERE ARE OTHER PROGRAMS, E.G., PILOTS THEN ADD ANOTHER Table 5d etc.

Table 5d: PPPD (PY 2026-2027) & Electrification Pilot (PY 2028-2031) [12]

Category	kWh	kW	Therms	Budget	Energy Savings Assistance Cost Effectiveness Test (ESACET)	Resource Test [1]	TRC [2]	PAC [2]	RIM [2]	SCB (Base) [3]	SCH (High) [3]
PY 2026 for PPPD (D.21-06-015) [9]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,526,683	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Proposed PY 2027 for PPPD (A.25-06-022) [10]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,791,059	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2028 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,176,604	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2029 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,028,837	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2030 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,088,895	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PY 2031 [11]	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,402,348	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Request (2028-2031)	-	-	-	\$ 7,696,684	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Cost Effectiveness Notes:

[1] - Formerly known as the Resource TRC, updated per: June 2018 Recommendations of the ESA Cost Effectiveness Working Group.

[2] - Provided for PY2021 through PY2026 in compliance with Decision 19-05-019.

[3] - SCT provided in compliance with D.24-07-015 OPI. There are two values for SCT: SCB or SCT Base and SCH or SCT High.

[4] - PY 2026, ESA Portfolio CET values are from ESA Main and MFWB values revised in A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A. Energy savings and budget are aggregated from Tables 5b-5d.

[5] - PY 2026, ESA Main CET values are from authorized SDG&E AL 3842-E/3012-G et al. effective October 1, 2021, and revised in A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A.

[6] - PY 2027 ESA Main CET values are from A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A.

[7] - PY 2026 MFWB CET values are from authorized SDG&E Advice Letter 4115-E/3144-G, Table 4, effective Dec 30, 2022 and revised in A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A.

[8] - PY 2027 MFWB CET values are from A.25-06-022 Supplemental Testimony, Attachment A.

[9] - PY 2026 PPPD Budget from D.21-06-015. No CET conducted and values are not available, per D.21-06-015 OP 38 and Attachment 2.

[10] - PY 2027 PPPD Budget from A.25-06-022. No CET conducted and values are not available, per D.21-06-015 OP 38 and Attachment 2.

[11] - Similar to D.21-06-015 OP 38 and Attachment 2 Guidance for Pilot Plus/Pilot Deep, no ESACET threshold was determined for new Electrification Pilot but shall be tracked during the cycle.

[12] Intentionally left blank - pending Commission approval and selection of implementer. Final electrification measures, quantities and savings will be determined once the Pilot implementer has been contracted.

[13] - The CET was updated on June 26, 2026 to correct an issue affecting electric cost-effectiveness outputs associated with Avoided Cost Version 2026. However, due to the timing of the update, the expected use of a different avoided cost version for reporting actuals, and SDG&E's decision not to re-run the ESACET analysis for the four-year plan—instead removing PY 2032 and 2033—the cost-effectiveness values presented in this table are representative of the CET version approved at the time the 6-year application was submitted.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 6: Annual ESA Household Treatment Targets¹

	Household Targets	Multifamily Property Targets²
Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015 & AL 4115E-3144G)	16,065	54
Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	14,766	46
PY 2028	8,750	5
PY 2029	10,150	25
PY 2030	10,150	30
PY 2031	10,150	30
Total (2028-2031)	39,200	90

Notes:

1. The household treatment targets for PYs 2028-2031 are for the ESA Portfolio, including Main ESA, MFWB in-units, with exception of any proposed pilots.
2. Multifamily Property Targets relates to whole building projects.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 7: ESA Portfolio Budget by Category (Show Full Budget Amount)

ESA Program Budget Categories	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015, AL 4115E-3144G & AL 4482-3324G) ⁴	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	Total Request (2028-2031)
EE Budget¹							
EE Main	\$ 17,214,498	\$ 17,214,377	\$ 15,420,693	\$ 15,975,679	\$ 16,477,562	\$ 16,986,067	\$ 64,860,001
EE-Pilots ⁵	\$ 1,526,683	\$ 1,791,059	\$ 711,020	\$ 1,632,442	\$ 1,763,135	\$ 1,721,040	\$ 5,827,637
EE-MF	\$ 8,394,059	\$ 10,726,978	\$ 4,243,266	\$ 7,270,689	\$ 7,488,155	\$ 7,714,366	\$ 26,716,476
EE Subtotal	\$ 27,135,240	\$ 29,732,414	\$ 20,374,979	\$ 24,878,810	\$ 25,728,852	\$ 26,421,473	\$ 97,404,114
Administrative²							
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 308,400	\$ 213,045	\$ 282,180	\$ 288,700	\$ 299,363	\$ 306,600	\$ 1,176,843
General Administration	\$ 3,347,835	\$ 3,205,773	\$ 2,004,747	\$ 2,754,197	\$ 2,744,013	\$ 2,873,426	\$ 10,376,383
Administrative Subtotal	\$ 3,656,235	\$ 3,418,818	\$ 2,286,927	\$ 3,042,897	\$ 3,043,376	\$ 3,180,026	\$ 11,553,226
Direct Implementation (DI)²							
Training Center	\$ 160,614	\$ 160,614	\$ 75,000	\$ 77,250	\$ 79,568	\$ 81,955	\$ 313,773
Workforce Education and Training	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Inspections	\$ 110,062	\$ 226,923	\$ 224,839	\$ 240,829	\$ 248,054	\$ 268,479	\$ 982,201
EE-MF - SPOC	\$ 651,613	\$ 462,333	\$ 190,007	\$ 188,548	\$ 202,455	\$ 201,476	\$ 782,486
Other DI Costs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,718,159	\$ 2,182,934	\$ 2,242,339	\$ 2,651,289	\$ 9,794,721
Marketing and Outreach²	\$ 1,674,124	\$ 1,630,135	\$ 1,668,772	\$ 1,581,714	\$ 1,598,901	\$ 1,590,787	\$ 6,440,174
EM&V²							
Studies ³	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 37,500	\$ 126,250	\$ 158,750	\$ 322,500
CPUC Energy Division	\$ 59,780	\$ 59,780	\$ 60,975	\$ 62,194	\$ 63,438	\$ 64,707	\$ 251,314
DI + Marketing & Outreach + EM&V Subtotal	\$ 2,706,193	\$ 2,589,785	\$ 4,937,752	\$ 4,370,969	\$ 4,561,005	\$ 5,017,443	\$ 18,887,169
Portfolio Total	\$ 33,497,668	\$ 35,741,017	\$ 27,599,658	\$ 32,292,676	\$ 33,333,233	\$ 34,618,942	\$ 127,844,509
Percentage of Administrative Costs (Admin/Total Portfolio)	10.9%	9.6%	8.3%	9.4%	9.1%	9.2%	9.0%

Notes:

- 1 - EE Budget includes measure (equipment) cost + implementer/subcontractor administration, outreach/education training, and installation cost (if outsourced). See Table A-1 and A-1a for details.
- 2 - These cost categories conform to the definition as used by Energy Efficiency programs and defined in Appendix C of the EE Policy Manual V2, April 2020. See D.21-06-015, OP 112. (ex. Engineering, Reporting).
- 3 - Study budget is the IOU Portion of Statewide Studies Budget from Tab A-4 Studies Budget.
- 4 - MFWB program budget per SDG&E Advice Letter 4115-E/3144-G, Table 4 and SDG&E's administrative costs as outlined in AL 4482-E/3324-G, Table 1. These amounts differs than the forecasted amount filed in the PY 2027 Bridge Application 25-06-022.
- 5 - Staff Proposal Pilot (PPPD) is leveraged for 2026 and 2027.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table 8: Concurrent Application System (CAS) Budget

CAS Budget Categories	PY 2025 [1]	PY 2026 [1]	PY 2027 [1]	PY 2028 [2]	PY 2029 [2]	PY 2030 [3]	PY 2031 [3]	Total PYs 2028-2031
Joint IOU Third Party Contract	\$ 607,650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 67,000	\$ 69,000	\$ 264,000
SDG&E IT/Programming, Administrative Costs	\$ 2,142,000	\$ 914,000	\$ 481,000	\$ 311,000	\$ 249,000	\$ 256,470	\$ 264,164	\$ 1,080,634
Total	\$ 2,749,650	\$ 914,000	\$ 481,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 314,000	\$ 323,470	\$ 333,164	\$ 1,344,634

Notes:

[1] - Resolution E-5394, OP 2 approved the \$4,051,000 CAS Phase 1 development budget from 2025 to 2027 and SDG&E's 15% cost share as requested in AL 4543-E/3365-G - \$4,051,000 X 15% = \$607,650.

OP 3 approved SDG&E's \$3,621,692 IT/administrative budget that covers PYs 2024-2027 as requested in AL 4543-E/3365-G.

[2] - Resolution E-5394 directs program year 2028 and 2029 to be included in the this application for approval.

[3] - Forecasted costs for IOU maintenance, assumes +3% annual escalation in Program Years 2030-2031.

Table A-1. Planning Assumptions

[illegible]

Intentionally left blank - pending Commission approval and selection of implementer. Final electrification measures, quantities and savings will be determined once the Pilot implementer has been contracted.

Notes:

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table A-2: Projected Participants by Housing Type

Projected Customers Treated		Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015 & AL 4115E-3144G)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031
Gas and Electric Customers							
	Single Family	2,660	2,883	2,588	2,588	2,588	2,588
	Multifamily	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mobile Homes	590	640	575	575	575	575
Owners - Total		3,250	3,523	3,163	3,163	3,163	3,163
	Single Family	2,660	2,883	2,512	2,512	2,512	2,512
	Multifamily	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mobile Homes	-	-	75	75	75	75
Renters - Total		2,660	2,883	2,587	2,587	2,587	2,587
MFWB Customers							
	Properties	54	46	5	25	30	30
	Multifamily Tenant Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Units Indirectly Treated (CAM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Owners - Total		54	46	5	25	30	30
	Properties	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Multifamily Tenant Units	10,155	8,360	3,000	4,400	4,400	4,400
	Units Indirectly Treated (CAM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Renters - Total		10,155	8,360	3,000	4,400	4,400	4,400

Notes:

* Multifamily is defined as 5 or more units as proposed in this Application.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table A-3 ESA Bill Savings

ESA Table A-3a				
Bill Savings Calculations by Program Year (ESA Main - SF, MH)				
Program Year	Program Costs	Program Lifecycle Bill Savings	Program Bill Savings/ Cost Ratio	Per Home Average Lifecycle Bill Savings
2028	\$ 20,379,166	\$ 8,580,679	0.4211	\$ 1,492
2029	\$ 21,139,444	\$ 8,628,092	0.4082	\$ 1,501
2030	\$ 21,851,074	\$ 8,668,026	0.3967	\$ 1,507
2031	\$ 22,544,158	\$ 8,708,793	0.3863	\$ 1,515

ESA Table A-3b					
Bill Savings Calculations by Program Year - MFWB (In-Unit and CAM)					
Program Year	Program Costs	Program Lifecycle Bill Savings	Program Bill Savings/ Cost Ratio	Per In-Unit Average Lifecycle Bill Savings	Per Property Average Lifecycle Bill Savings
2028	\$ 6,043,887	\$ 3,749,809	0.6204	\$ 1,038	\$ 127,389
2029	\$ 9,124,395	\$ 6,218,359	0.6815	\$ 1,122	\$ 51,266
2030	\$ 9,393,265	\$ 6,105,221	0.6500	\$ 1,109	\$ 40,792
2031	\$ 9,672,437	\$ 6,227,503	0.6438	\$ 1,123	\$ 42,814

ESA Table A-3c				
Bill Savings Calculations by Program Year (Electrification Pilot)				
Intentionally left blank - pending Commission approval and selection of implementer.				
Program Year	Program Costs	Program Lifecycle Bill Savings	Program Bill Savings/ Cost Ratio	Per Home Average Lifecycle Bill Savings
2028	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -
2029	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -
2030	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -
2031	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	\$ -

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table A-4: ESA and CARE Studies Budget

	Proposed Timelines and Budgets for Future Studies & Evaluation											
	ESA				CARE							
	2028	2029	2030	2031	2028	2029	2030	2031	[1] ESA Funded Total	[2] CARE Funded Total	SDGE Total	All IOUs Proposed Budget
Studies ^[1]												
2031 Low Income Needs Assessments ^[2]			\$ 18,750	\$ 18,750			\$ 18,750	\$ 18,750	\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 75,000	\$ 500,000
Impact Evaluations (2 studies): ESA Main and MFWB ^[3]			\$ 70,000	\$ 140,000					\$ 210,000		\$ 210,000	\$ 1,400,000
Non-Energy Benefits Study + Tool Update ^[4]		\$ 37,500	\$ 37,500						\$ 75,000		\$ 75,000	\$ 500,000
SDG&E Portion (15%) for Statewide Studies ^[5]		\$ 37,500	\$ 126,250	\$ 158,750			\$ 18,750	\$ 18,750	\$ 322,500	\$ 37,500	\$ 360,000	
Evolving Study and Data Needs Budgets (Each IOU) ^[6]		\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,350,000
Total ^[7]											\$ 660,000	\$ 3,750,000

Notes:

Table A-4 does not include FERA funded studies such as the joint IOU annual estimates of customers eligible for CARE and FERA programs.

Assumptions:

[1] Statewide Low-Income EM&V study budget payments are allocated as: 30% PG&E, 30% SCE, 25% SoCal Gas and SDG&E 15%.

[2] For the 2031 and 2034 LINAs, assume spending is evenly spread across 2030 and 2031. LINA studies are funded 50/50 via ESA and CARE budgets. The 2028 LINA will be conducted during PYs 2027 and 2028.

[3] For Impact Evaluations, assume program ramp-up will take place in 2028, and 2029 would be the representative year for program data analyses.

[4] For Non-Energy-Benefits Study, assume spending is evenly spread across program years 2029 and 2030.

[5] These values excludes the Evolving Study and Data Needs budget amounts.

[6] Evolving Study and Data Needs budget is not a statewide study. PG&E, SoCalGas, and SCE are each requesting \$350,000 and SDG&E is requesting \$300,000. Assumes spending is spread across program years 2029, 2030, and 2031.

[7] The total incorporates all IOU proposed statewide study budgets as well as the evolving needs budget for all IOUs.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table B-1: CARE Program Budget

CARE Budget Categories	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	Total PYs 2028-2031
Outreach	\$ 3,501,185	\$ 2,519,823	\$ 2,716,798	\$ 2,744,039	\$ 2,771,829	\$ 2,800,180	\$ 11,032,846
Processing, Certification, Recertification	\$ 687,401	\$ 1,635,357	\$ 1,953,865	\$ 2,032,196	\$ 2,113,666	\$ 2,198,400	\$ 8,298,127
Post Enrollment Verification	\$ 533,984	\$ 533,984	\$ 358,757	\$ 372,051	\$ 385,845	\$ 400,157	\$ 1,516,810
Enrollment and Reenrollment Verification (SCE Only)							\$ -
IT Programming	\$ 1,202,602	\$ 1,202,602	\$ 1,318,617	\$ 1,333,531	\$ 1,348,892	\$ 1,364,715	\$ 5,365,755
Studies & Pilots	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,625	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 38,625	\$ 137,250
Measurement & Evaluation	\$ 21,538	\$ 21,538	\$ 84,316	\$ 85,495	\$ 86,710	\$ 87,961	\$ 344,482
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 347,761	\$ 358,194	\$ 350,125	\$ 359,876	\$ 369,920	\$ 380,265	\$ 1,460,186
General Administration	\$ 765,768	\$ 788,741	\$ 546,519	\$ 662,660	\$ 579,286	\$ 696,411	\$ 2,484,876
CPUC							
Energy Division Staff	\$ 76,410	\$ 76,410	\$ 78,702	\$ 81,063	\$ 83,495	\$ 86,000	\$ 329,260
CHANGE ¹	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 1,060,000
SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	\$ 7,401,649	\$ 7,401,649	\$ 7,711,324	\$ 7,965,911	\$ 8,034,643	\$ 8,317,714	\$ 32,029,592
CARE Discount Budget ²	\$ 126,524,206	\$ 218,878,622	\$ 213,416,309	\$ 215,550,473	\$ 217,705,977	\$ 219,883,037	\$ 866,555,796
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS & CUSTOMER DISCOUNTS	\$ 133,925,855	\$ 226,280,271	\$ 221,127,633	\$ 223,516,384	\$ 225,740,620	\$ 228,200,751	\$ 898,585,388

Notes:

1 - CHANGES is managed by the Commission's Consumers Affairs Branch and Energy Division staff.

2 - CARE Discount is based on 2026 CARE PPP forecast in AL 4717-E filed 9/30/25 and AL 3462-G filed 10/31/25 +1% per year, an accepted annual forecasting methodology.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table B-2: 2028-2031 CARE Enrollment/Participation

	Total Enrolled 12-31-24	Total Enrolled Through August 2025	Estimated PY2025 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY2025 Participation	Estimated PY 2025 Enrollment Rate (a)	Estimated PY2026 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY2026 Participation	Estimated PY 2026 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2025 to 2026	Estimated PY2027 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2027 Participation	Estimated PY 2027 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2026 to 2027
(Source)	(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)		(3)	(4)			(3)	(4)	
	305,902	291,660	-7,800	298,102	104%	-7,800	290,302	101%	-3%	-7,800	282,502	98%	-3%

Estimated PY 2028 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2028 Participation	Estimated PY 2028 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2027 to 2028	Estimated PY 2029 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2029 Participation	Estimated PY 2029 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2028 to 2029	Estimated PY 2030 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2030 Participation	Estimated PY 2030 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2029 to 2030
		(4)				(4)				(4)	
-5,000	277,502	96%	-2%	-4,500	273,002	95%	-2%	-4,000	269,002	93%	-1%

Estimated PY 2031 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2031 Participation	Estimated PY 2031 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2030 to 2031
		(4)	
-3,500	265,502	92%	-1%

Notes:

- (a) Estimated CARE Enrollment Rate will fluctuate based on updated CARE Eligibility information.
- (1) CARE 2024 Annual Report dated June 27, 2025.
- (2) CARE Net Enrollment as of SDG&E's August 2025 Low Income Monthly Report dated September 22, 2025.
- (3) Based on most recent estimates from 2025 enrollments, eligibility factors.
- (4) Assumes maintaining or exceeding program goal of 90% enrollment.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table C-1: FERA Program Budget

FERA Budget Categories	Approved PY 2026 (D.21-06-015)	Proposed PY 2027 (A.25-06-022)	PY 2028	PY 2029	PY 2030	PY 2031	Total PYs 2028-2031
Outreach	\$ 375,741	\$ 625,741	\$ 1,062,396	\$ 1,072,721	\$ 1,083,245	\$ 1,093,872	\$ 4,312,234
Processing, Certification, Recertification	\$ 15,061	\$ 71,115	\$ 24,703	\$ 25,444	\$ 26,208	\$ 26,994	\$ 103,349
Post Enrollment Verification	\$ 1,122	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,773	\$ 36,846	\$ 37,952	\$ 39,090	\$ 149,661
Enrollment and Reenrollment Verification (SCE Only)							\$ -
IT Programming	\$ 57,963	\$ 57,963	\$ 576,160	\$ 582,045	\$ 588,106	\$ 594,349	\$ 2,340,660
Studies & Pilots	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,900	\$ 30,900	\$ 30,900	\$ 30,900	\$ 123,600
Measurement & Evaluation	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 55,450	\$ 45,305	\$ 45,464	\$ 55,928	\$ 202,147
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 48,860	\$ 50,326	\$ 84,491	\$ 86,849	\$ 89,277	\$ 91,778	\$ 352,395
General Administration	\$ 80,160	\$ 82,579	\$ 97,692	\$ 100,620	\$ 103,636	\$ 106,742	\$ 408,690
CPUC Energy Division Staff	\$ 11,461	\$ 11,461	\$ 11,805	\$ 12,159	\$ 12,524	\$ 12,899	\$ 49,387
Subtotal Administrative Costs	\$ 640,368	\$ 984,185	\$ 1,979,370	\$ 1,992,889	\$ 2,017,312	\$ 2,052,552	\$ 8,042,123
FERA Discount Budget	\$ 5,388,762	\$ 5,449,903	\$ 11,254,869	\$ 12,439,592	\$ 13,624,315	\$ 14,809,038	\$ 52,127,814
Total Program Costs & Customer Discounts	\$ 6,029,130	\$ 6,434,088	\$ 13,234,239	\$ 14,432,481	\$ 15,641,627	\$ 16,861,590	\$ 60,169,937

San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Table C-2 2028-2031 FERA Enrollment/Participation

	Total Enrolled 12-31-24	Total Enrolled Through August 2025	Estimated PY2025 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY2025 Participation	Estimated PY 2025 Enrollment Rate (a)	Estimated PY2026 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY2026 Participation	Estimated PY 2026 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2025 to 2026	Estimated PY2027 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2027 Participation	Estimated PY 2027 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2026 to 2027
(Source)	(1)		(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)		(2)	(2)	(2)	
	12,768	16,953	7,200	19,968	25%	7,075	27,043	33%	35%	7,075	34,118	42%	26%

Estimated PY 2028 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2028 Participation	Estimated PY 2028 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2027 to 2028	Estimated PY 2029 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2029 Participation	Estimated PY 2029 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2028 to 2029	Estimated PY 2030 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2030 Participation	Estimated PY 2030 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2029 to 2030
(3a)	(4)	(4)		(3a)	(3a)	(4)		(3a)	(3a)	(4)	
4,366	38,484	47.5%	13%	4,051	42,535	52.5%	11%	4,051	46,586	57.5%	10%

Estimated PY 2031 Net Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2031 Participation	Estimated PY 2031 Enrollment Rate (a)	% changes in enrollment 2030 to 2031
(3a)	(4)	(4)	
4,051	50,637	62.5%	9%

Notes:

- (a) Estimated Goal Rate will fluctuate based on updated FERA Eligibility information.
 (1) FERA 2024 Annual Report dated March 2, 2025.
 (2) Prepared Testimony of Roland Mollen on behalf of SDG&E ERRATA August 28, 2025 Table D-2 at SDG&E - 15.
 (3) Based on most recent estimates from 2025 enrollments, eligibility factors.
 (4) Assumes 70% enrollment goal.

Table D-1: CARE/ESA/CAS Gas Rate Impacts ^[1]

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]
2028								
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04990	0.04622	0.00167	0.04756	0.00430	NA	0.09975	0.14964
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.04756	0.00430	NA	0.05185	0.10175
Commercial ^[4]	0.16061	0.04622	0.00167	0.01384	0.00125	NA	0.06298	0.22359
Industrial ^[5]	0.15595	0.04622	0.00167	0.00367	0.00033	NA	0.05189	0.20784
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
System	0.08952	0.04622	0.00167	0.03060	0.00277	NA	0.08126	0.17078

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]
2029								
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04984	0.04674	0.00173	0.05495	0.00572	NA	0.10914	0.15898
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.05495	0.00572	NA	0.06067	0.11057
Commercial ^[4]	0.16055	0.04674	0.00173	0.01599	0.00166	NA	0.06612	0.22667
Industrial ^[5]	0.15589	0.04674	0.00173	0.00424	0.00044	NA	0.05314	0.20904
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
System	0.08942	0.04674	0.00173	0.03536	0.00368	NA	0.08751	0.17693

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]
2030								
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04983	0.04722	0.00174	0.05691	0.00572	NA	0.11159	0.16141
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.05691	0.00572	NA	0.06262	0.11252
Commercial ^[4]	0.16054	0.04722	0.00174	0.01656	0.00166	NA	0.06719	0.22772
Industrial ^[5]	0.15588	0.04722	0.00174	0.00439	0.00044	NA	0.05379	0.20967
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
System	0.08936	0.04722	0.00174	0.03662	0.00368	NA	0.08926	0.17862

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	CARE Discount Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	ESA Program Administration Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	CAS Portion of Rate (\$/Therm)	Total CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]	Average Rate Including CARE/ESA Surcharge (\$/Therm) ^[3]
2031								
Customer Type								
Residential (non CARE)	0.04977	0.04776	0.00180	0.05907	0.00597	NA	0.11460	0.16436
Residential (CARE)	0.04990	0.00000	0.00000	0.05907	0.00597	NA	0.06504	0.11494
Commercial ^[4]	0.16048	0.04776	0.00180	0.01719	0.00174	NA	0.06848	0.22896
Industrial ^[5]	0.15582	0.04776	0.00180	0.00456	0.00046	NA	0.05457	0.21039
Agricultural	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
System	0.08925	0.04776	0.00180	0.03801	0.00384	NA	0.09141	0.18067

Notes:

[1] The table above is based off of January 1, 2026 Public Purpose Program Surcharge rates.

[2] Category types will vary across IOUs.

[3] GAS CAS revenue requirement is part of transportation rates and not part of Public Purchase Surcharge Rate. Bundled rates include CAS revenue requirement .

[4] Core C/I- Core Commercial and Industrial Customers generally use smaller quantities of gas, and the utility purchases their gas.

[5] Noncore C/I-Non-Core Commercial and Industrial Customers are generally large gas users who purchase their own natural gas supplies for SoCalGas to transport.

Note: Associated balancing account amortizations are excluded from projected rate impacts.

Table D-2: CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Electric Rate Impacts ^[1]

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2028										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.352	1.070	0.039	0.063	0.011	0.051	0.005	0.001	1.240	48.592
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.489	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.051	0.005	0.001	0.057	28.546
Small Commercial	38.059	1.070	0.039	0.063	0.011	0.051	0.005	0.001	1.240	39.299
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.964	1.070	0.039	0.063	0.011	0.051	0.005	0.001	1.240	38.204
Agriculture	26.175	1.070	0.039	0.063	0.011	0.051	0.005	0.001	1.240	27.415
Lighting	34.935	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.935
System	38.107	1.070	0.039	0.063	0.011	0.051	0.005	0.001	1.240	39.347

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2029										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.355	1.081	0.040	0.069	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.267	48.622
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.509	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.059	0.006	0.001	0.066	28.575
Small Commercial	38.062	1.081	0.040	0.069	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.267	39.329
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.966	1.081	0.040	0.069	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.267	38.233
Agriculture	26.176	1.081	0.040	0.069	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.267	27.443
Lighting	34.937	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.937
System	38.108	1.081	0.040	0.069	0.011	0.059	0.006	0.001	1.267	39.375

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2030										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.357	1.091	0.040	0.076	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.286	48.643
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.528	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.061	0.006	0.001	0.068	28.596
Small Commercial	38.064	1.091	0.040	0.076	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.286	39.350
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.968	1.091	0.040	0.076	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.286	38.254
Agriculture	26.178	1.091	0.040	0.076	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.286	27.464
Lighting	34.938	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.938
System	38.110	1.091	0.040	0.076	0.011	0.061	0.006	0.001	1.286	39.396

Category ^[2]	Average Rate Excluding CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh)	CARE Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CARE Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Rate Discount Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	FERA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Program Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	ESA Administration Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	CAS Portion of Rate (¢/kWh)	Total CARE/FERA/ESA/CAS Surcharge (¢/kWh) ^[3]	Average Rate including surcharge (¢/kWh)
2031										
Residential (non-CARE) ^[4]	47.360	1.102	0.042	0.082	0.011	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.307	48.667
Residential (CARE) ^[4]	28.550	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.063	0.006	0.001	0.070	28.620
Small Commercial	38.066	1.102	0.042	0.082	0.011	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.307	39.373
Med. & Lg. Commercial & Industrial	36.968	1.102	0.042	0.082	0.011	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.307	38.275
Agriculture	26.180	1.102	0.042	0.082	0.011	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.307	27.487
Lighting	34.939	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.939
System	38.112	1.102	0.042	0.082	0.011	0.063	0.006	0.001	1.307	39.419

Notes:

[1] - Rates are based on current rates effective 1/1/2026. Separation of Medium Commercial and Large C&I customer classes was implemented with the 2024 GRC P2 and effective 4/1/2026 per AL 4791-E/E-A.

[2] - Category types will vary across IOUs.

[3] - Associated balancing account amortizations are excluded from projected rate impacts.

[4] - Residential Non-CARE and CARE customer types are included for illustrative purposes. Residential CARE customers are exempt from CARE/FERA discounts and administration costs.