

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco CA 94102-3298



Pacific Gas & Electric Company
GAS (Corp ID 39)
Status of Advice Letter 4774G/6989E
As of November 16, 2023

Subject: Implementation of Franchise Surcharge for Electric and Gas Customers within the City of Richmond Pursuant to D. 89-05-063.

Division Assigned: Energy

Date Filed: 07-17-2023

Date to Calendar: 07-19-2023

Authorizing Documents: D8905063

Disposition:	Accepted
Effective Date:	08-16-2023

Resolution Required: No

Resolution Number: None

Commission Meeting Date: None

CPUC Contact Information:

edtariffunit@cpuc.ca.gov

AL Certificate Contact Information:

Stuart Rubio

279-789-6210

PGETariffs@pge.com

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco CA 94102-3298



To: Energy Company Filing Advice Letter

From: Energy Division PAL Coordinator

Subject: Your Advice Letter Filing

The Energy Division of the California Public Utilities Commission has processed your recent Advice Letter (AL) filing and is returning an AL status certificate for your records.

The AL status certificate indicates:

- Advice Letter Number
- Name of Filer
- CPUC Corporate ID number of Filer
- Subject of Filing
- Date Filed
- Disposition of Filing (Accepted, Rejected, Withdrawn, etc.)
- Effective Date of Filing
- Other Miscellaneous Information (e.g., Resolution, if applicable, etc.)

The Energy Division has made no changes to your copy of the Advice Letter Filing; please review your Advice Letter Filing with the information contained in the AL status certificate, and update your Advice Letter and tariff records accordingly.

All inquiries to the California Public Utilities Commission on the status of your Advice Letter Filing will be answered by Energy Division staff based on the information contained in the Energy Division's PAL database from which the AL status certificate is generated. If you have any questions on this matter please contact the:

Energy Division's Tariff Unit by e-mail to
edtariffunit@cpuc.ca.gov



July 17, 2023

Advice 4774-G/6989-E

(Pacific Gas and Electric Company ID U 39 M)

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California

Subject: Implementation of Franchise Surcharge for Electric and Gas Customers within the City of Richmond Pursuant to D. 89-05-063.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) hereby requests approval by the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission or CPUC) to approve a one and three-tenths percent (1.3%) surcharge on the bills of electric and gas customers in the City of Richmond (Richmond or City), a charter city, pursuant to recent amendments to the electric and gas franchise agreements that were originally granted in 1958 (the Franchise Amendments). The request is made pursuant to the Franchise Amendments that require CPUC approval of the surcharges, and the guidance set forth in the Commission's Decision (D.) 89-05-063, dated May 26, 1989 (32 CPUC 2d 60),¹ which established the procedure for filing an advice letter where the local governmental entity requires the public utility to collect franchise fees exceeding the average franchise fees within the service territory of the utility.

Purpose

Pursuant to D.89-05-063 PG&E proposes to apply a 1.3% franchise fee surcharge to the bills of PG&E electric and gas customers in Richmond, as provided in the Franchise Amendments adopted by the City Council of Richmond on May 16, 2023 as Ordinance Nos. 05-23 N.S. and 06-23 N.S., set forth in Attachment A. The Franchise Amendments are contingent upon Commission approval of the 1.3% franchise fee surcharge.

PG&E believes that a surcharge on Richmond customers is the most reasonable and objective way to cover the franchise fee differential, as compared to the franchise fee formula set by under the Franchise Act of 1937, without unduly burdening other ratepayers in the PG&E system. Under the terms of the Franchise Amendments, for PG&E to bill and collect the franchise surcharges, PG&E must obtain the Commission's approval.

¹ Investigation 84-05-002, Guidelines For the Equitable Treatment of Revenue-Producing Mechanisms Imposed By Local Governmental Entities on Public Utilities.

Background

In 1937, the California State Legislature passed "The Franchise Act of 1937" (the 37' Act).² Among other subjects, the 37' Act established a formula whereby a utility would pay a fee to a general law municipality for the right to use the public streets and rights-of-way in the municipality. The 37' Act sets out that, for gas franchises, municipalities will be compensated through a formula whereby they will receive 2% of gross annual receipts derived from the use, operation or possession of the franchise (also known as the Broughton Act formula), or a minimum of 1.0% of gross annual receipts from the sale, transmission, or distribution of gas within the limits of the municipality. For electric franchises, municipalities also receive the same 2%/1% formula, except that those cities where the utility has a constitutional franchise, the rate is reduced to one half of one percent (0.5%) of gross annual receipts from the sale, transmission, or distribution of electricity within the limits of the municipality.³ By statute, charter cities, such as Richmond, are not limited to these formulas.⁴

In 1958 Richmond granted PG&E electric and gas franchises, Ordinance Nos. 1579 and 1580. Under the electric franchise agreement, the City has received 0.5% of PG&E' gross annual receipts from the sale, transmission, or distribution of electricity within the City limits.⁵ Under the gas franchise agreement with PG&E, the City has received 1% of PG&E' gross annual receipts from the sale, transmission, or distribution of gas within the City limits.

Section 5 of these franchise agreements provided that either party may request a change in the franchise fee rate upon the 20th anniversary of the granting of the franchise, provided at least one of three conditions has been satisfied.⁶ Section 5 provided that if

² Public Utilities Code Section 6201, et seq.

³ Public Utilities Code Section 6231.

⁴ Public Utilities Code section 6205. Although Richmond is a charter city, the original 1958 franchise agreements set the initial franchise fee based on the '37 Act formula, subject to the potential for either party to request a change in the rate in the future, as provided in Section 5 of the franchise agreements.

⁵ Although the 37' Act sets out two alternative formulas for determining the franchise fee, the specified percentage of PG&E's gross receipts has historically been the higher of these two alternative formulas.

⁶ Section 5 provided "This franchise shall be subject to such change in measure or amount of annual payments only if there has occurred one or more of the following: a) A substantial change in economic conditions affecting franchise payments hereunder; b) A method of distribution of [electricity/gas] other than that used at the time of the grant of this franchise, which changed method of distribution substantially increases or decreases the burden on the streets of City or substantially increases or decreases costs and expenses to city; or c) A revised method of franchise payment in a substantial number of other cities served by grantee."

the parties are unable to agree to the rate, or whether the conditions have occurred, the matter shall be submitted to arbitration.

In 2018, Richmond requested a change in the franchise fee rate. Because the parties did not agree on whether the conditions in Section 5 had been satisfied, the matter was submitted to arbitration.⁷ On February 23, 2022, the arbitrator issued a decision that Richmond had satisfied two of the conditions specified in Section 5 and may request a change in rate. Before submitting to further arbitration proceedings in which the arbitrator would determine the appropriate change in rate, Richmond and PG&E reached agreement on an informal resolution of Richmond's request for a change in the franchise fee rates. The agreement contemplates that, subject to the Commission's approval and in accordance with D.89-05-063, a 1.3% increase in electric and gas franchise fee rates would be collected as a surcharge from customers in the City of Richmond. PG&E further agreed to increase the electric franchise fee from 0.5% to 1%--the rate specified in the '37 Act for all general law cities⁸--and that this portion of the increase in the electric franchise fee would be collected in PG&E's rates from all customers. In addition, PG&E agreed to bear the cost necessary to implement the surcharge in its billing system and provide additional compensation to the City for the granting of the Franchise Amendments, which will be paid in four annual installments, concurrent with the payment of franchise fees in April. Under the Franchise Amendments, the total franchise fee paid to Richmond will be 2.3% for each commodity.

In D.89-05-063, the Commission addressed the issue of costs imposed on public utilities by local government's revenue producing mechanisms and the appropriate ratemaking treatment for increases in franchise fees. The Commission recognized that where franchise fees attributable to one city were significantly above the average franchise fees within the service territory of the utility, requiring all customers to pay the city's higher-than average costs in rates would mean that some customers would be subsidizing other customers, but not themselves receiving any benefits from increased taxes and fees. The Commission stated:

To continue to incorporate significantly differing levels of new and escalating local entity taxes and fees in basic rates applicable equally to all ratepayers in a utility's service territory, increasingly means that some of these ratepayers would be subsidizing others but are not themselves benefiting from such increased taxes and fees. It is not just or reasonable that the significantly higher levels derived from some entities only should be buried in basic rates applicable to all ratepayers of the utility. Averaging such costs among all ratepayers creates inequities between classes of ratepayers. It is appropriate and reasonable that these significantly higher costs should

⁷ The arbitration was held before the Hon. Richard M. Silver, (ret.) with Judicial Arbitration and Mediation Services, JAMS No. 11100250023.

⁸ That is, assuming no constitutional franchise exists in that municipality.

be identified and borne only by the ratepayers in the local governmental area that originated them.⁹

As summarized above, the 1958 franchise agreements had resulted in the City receiving a 0.5% electric franchise fee and 1% gas franchise fee. Under the Franchise Amendments adopted in May, 2023 (Ordinance Nos. 05-23 N.S. and 06-23 N.S.) PG&E agreed to pay Richmond a 2.3% franchise fee on both the electric and gas franchises. Pursuant to D.89-05-063, PG&E proposes to collect a 1.3% franchise fee surcharge from PG&E customers within the limits of the City, except for customers participating in PG&E's California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) Program. Such a franchise fee surcharge has been approved by the Commission in the cities of Bakersfield, San Jose and Fresno (gas).¹⁰ The Commission has also approved franchise fee surcharges by other public utilities.¹¹

Proposed Franchise Fee Surcharge

To mitigate the rate impact on other customers, PG&E accepted franchise amendments with Richmond that contained a franchise calculation whereby, if authorized by the Commission, PG&E would pay the higher franchise fees to Richmond and would collect the portion of the franchise fee greater than the current franchise agreement amount by placing a 1.3% line item franchise fee surcharge on bills to electric and gas customers located within Richmond. In accordance with D.89-05-063 and Section 4.1 of the Franchise Amendments with the City, which provides for the franchise fee surcharge, PG&E shall collect, with the Commission's approval, an additional 1.3% as a franchise fee surcharge on customers in Richmond. The additional 1.3% franchise fee surcharge shall be so indicated and added as a separate line item to bills rendered to Richmond customers. The percentage will be the same for all classes of electric and gas customers located within the City, except for customers participating in PG&E's California

⁹ 32 CPUC 2d at 69.

¹⁰ See PG&E's Advice 3138-G dated September 16, 2010 (authorizing PG&E to bill and collect a 1.0% franchise fee surcharge on gas customers in the City of Fresno); Advice 3110-G/3651-E dated April 5, 2010 (authorizing PG&E to bill and collect a 0.3% franchise fee surcharge on electric and gas customers in the City of San Jose, for a total franchise fee of 2.3%); and Advice Letter No. 2980-G/3380-E dated December 18, 2008 (authorizing PG&E to bill and collect a 1.0% franchise fee surcharge on electric and gas customers in the City of Bakersfield).

¹¹ See, e.g., SoCalGas Advice No. 5938 dated February 11, 2022 (relating to a 3.5% franchise fee surcharge for SoCalGas customers in Los Angeles). Advice No. 5938 further reports (p. 4 and fn. 11) that the Commission has approved franchise fee surcharges in five other municipalities in SoCalGas's service territory, Long Beach, Bakersfield, Visalia, Huntington Beach, and San Buenaventura (Ventura). See also, SCE Advice Letter No. 2377-E dated August 26, 2009 (relating to a 1.0% franchise fee surcharge on SCE customers in Buenaventura (Ventura)); SCE Advice No. 1881-E dated March 30, 2005 (relating to a 1.0% electric franchise fee surcharge on SCE customers in Santa Barbara).

Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) Program who will not be subject to the franchise fee surcharge per the agreement with the City.

Based on the gross annual gas and electric receipts in the City during 2022, PG&E estimates that the electric and gas surcharge will result in an additional collection of approximately \$3 million annually. For example, residential customers can expect a monthly increase in their electric bill of \$0.75 (representing an increase of approximately \$9 on an annual basis) and \$0.67 on their monthly gas bill (representing an increase of approximately \$8 on an annual basis).

PG&E shall implement the electric and gas franchise surcharge as soon as reasonably possible after Commission approval.

Protests

Anyone wishing to protest this submittal may do so by letter sent electronically via E-mail, no later than August 7, 2023, which is 21¹² days after the date of this submittal. Protests must be submitted to:

CPUC Energy Division
ED Tariff Unit
E-mail: EDTariffUnit@cpuc.ca.gov

The protest shall also be electronically sent to PG&E via E-mail at the address shown below on the same date it is electronically delivered to the Commission:

Sidney Bob Dietz II
Director, Regulatory Relations
c/o Megan Lawson
E-mail: PGETariffs@pge.com

Any person (including individuals, groups, or organizations) may protest or respond to an advice letter (General Order 96-B, Section 7.4). The protest shall contain the following information: specification of the advice letter protested; grounds for the protest; supporting factual information or legal argument; name and e-mail address of the protestant; and statement that the protest was sent to the utility no later than the day on which the protest was submitted to the reviewing Industry Division (General Order 96-B, Section 3.11).

¹² Pursuant to Rule 1.5 of General Order 96-B, PG&E requests to extend the protest period by one additional day because twenty days following submission of this advice letter is Sunday, August 6, 2023.

Effective Date

Pursuant to General Order (GO) 96-B, Rule 5.2, this advice letter is submitted with a Tier 2 designation. PG&E requests that this Tier 2 advice submittal become effective on regular notice, August 16, 2023, which is 30 calendar days after the date of submittal.

Notice

In accordance with General Order 96-B, Section IV, a copy of this advice letter is being sent electronically to parties shown on the attached list. Address changes to the General Order 96-B service list should be directed to PG&E at email address PGETariffs@pge.com. For changes to any other service list, please contact the Commission's Process Office at (415) 703-2021 or at Process_Office@cpuc.ca.gov. Send all electronic approvals to PGETariffs@pge.com. Advice letter submittals can also be accessed electronically at: <http://www.pge.com/tariffs/>.

/S/

Sidney Bob Dietz II
Director, Regulatory Relations
CPUC Communications

Attachments: Attachment A – Franchise Amendments

Cc: Samantha Carr, Environmental Manager, City of Richmond



ADVICE LETTER SUMMARY

ENERGY UTILITY



MUST BE COMPLETED BY UTILITY (Attach additional pages as needed)

Company name/CPUC Utility No.: Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39 M)

Utility type:

☒ ELC ☒ GAS ☐ WATER
☐ PLC ☐ HEAT

Contact Person: Stuart Rubio

Phone #: 279-789-6210

E-mail: PGETariffs@pge.com

E-mail Disposition Notice to: stuart.rubio@pge.com

EXPLANATION OF UTILITY TYPE

ELC = Electric GAS = Gas WATER = Water
PLC = Pipeline HEAT = Heat

(Date Submitted / Received Stamp by CPUC)

Advice Letter (AL) #: 4774-G/6989-E

Tier Designation: 2

Subject of AL: Implementation of Franchise Surcharge for Electric and Gas Customers within the City of Richmond
Pursuant to D. 89-05-063.

Keywords (choose from CPUC listing): Compliance

AL Type: ☐ Monthly ☐ Quarterly ☐ Annual ☒ One-Time ☐ Other:

If AL submitted in compliance with a Commission order, indicate relevant Decision/Resolution #: D.89-05-063

Does AL replace a withdrawn or rejected AL? If so, identify the prior AL: No

Summarize differences between the AL and the prior withdrawn or rejected AL: N/A

Confidential treatment requested? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, specification of confidential information:

Confidential information will be made available to appropriate parties who execute a nondisclosure agreement. Name and contact information to request nondisclosure agreement/ access to confidential information:

Resolution required? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Requested effective date: 8/16/23

No. of tariff sheets: 0

Estimated system annual revenue effect (%): N/A

Estimated system average rate effect (%): N/A

When rates are affected by AL, include attachment in AL showing average rate effects on customer classes (residential, small commercial, large C/I, agricultural, lighting).

Tariff schedules affected: N/A

Service affected and changes proposed¹: N/A

Pending advice letters that revise the same tariff sheets: N/A

¹Discuss in AL if more space is needed.

Protests and correspondence regarding this AL are to be sent via email and are due no later than 20 days after the date of this submittal, unless otherwise authorized by the Commission, and shall be sent to:

California Public Utilities Commission
Energy Division Tariff Unit Email:
EDTariffUnit@cpuc.ca.gov

Contact Name: Sidnev Bob Dietz II. c/o Megan Lawson
Title: Director, Regulatory Relations
Utility/Entity Name: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Telephone (xxx) xxx-xxxx: (415)973-2093
Facsimile (xxx) xxx-xxxx:
Email: PGETariffs@pge.com

Contact Name:
Title:
Utility/Entity Name:

Telephone (xxx) xxx-xxxx:
Facsimile (xxx) xxx-xxxx:
Email:

CPUC
Energy Division Tariff Unit
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Clear Form

Attachment A

Franchise Amendments

ORDINANCE NO. 05-23 N.S.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 1579 WHICH GRANTED A FRANCHISE FOR THE TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY WITHIN THE CITY OF RICHMOND TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY TO REVISE THE FRANCHISE FEE AND ADD A FRANCHISE FEE SURCHARGE

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND:

SECTION 1. Ordinance No. 1579, is amended to entirely replace Section 4 and add a new Section 4.1, to be numbered and entitled and to read as follows:

SECTION 4.

Grantee shall pay to City annually, either two per cent (2%) of the gross annual receipts of grantee arising from the use, operation or possession of the franchise granted hereby, or a sum which shall be equivalent to one per cent (1%) of the gross annual receipts derived by grantee from the sale of electricity within the limits of city under both the franchise granted hereby and said constitutional franchise, if any, whichever is the greater; provided that the measure or amount of annual payments may be changed as provided in Section 5 hereof.

SECTION 4.1

- (a) This amending Ordinance is granted upon the express condition of, and in exchange for, the commitment by grantee that grantee, as consideration therefore and as compensation for use of the streets of the City, as herein authorized and permitted shall pay to the City during the term (in addition to the franchise fees specified in Section 4) an additional one and three tenths per cent (1.3%) of the gross annual receipts of grantee (the "Franchise Fee Surcharge") from all electric utility customers served by grantee within the boundaries of the City. The customer collection shall be applied equally to grantee's electric utility customers based on the consumption or use of electricity, including residential, commercial, industrial, government and wholesale customers, excluding those customers participating in grantee's California Alternative Rates for Energy (CARE) Program or successor low-income assistance program.
- (b) Prior to grantee's payment to City of the Franchise Fee Surcharge, grantee shall receive approval from the California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") to collect the Franchise Fee Surcharge in accordance with Commission Decision 89-05-063, *Guidelines for the Equitable Treatment of Revenue Producing Mechanisms Imposed by Local Government Entities on Public Utilities*, 32 CPUC2d 60, May 26, 1989.
- (c) The City shall cooperate with grantee in the preparation of any filings, data request responses or other approvals required for review of such approval.
- (d) If the Franchise Fee Surcharge is approved by the Commission, grantee shall implement customer billings of the Franchise Fee Surcharge as soon as reasonably possible thereafter.
- (e) The Franchise Fee Surcharge shall be remitted to the City on an annual basis, on or before the fifteenth (15th) day from and after the time for filing of the duly verified statement showing in detail the gross receipts of grantee during the prior calendar year or fractional calendar year.
- (f) In the event that any modification or repeal of the Franchise Fee Surcharge is issued by the CPUC, or in the event that the CPUC issues any order or decision that conflicts with grantee's collection of the Franchise Fee Surcharge, or in the event that any changes in law or ruling in accordance with law negates the imposition or collection of the Franchise Fee Surcharge, then grantee shall reduce or eliminate collection of the Franchise Fee Surcharge in an amount that corresponds to the change resulting from the CPUC's orders, actions,

decisions, or as a result of any ruling or change in law. Grantee shall make a corresponding reduction in the Franchise Fee Surcharge paid to the City as part of franchise fee due in annual period thereafter.

SECTION 2. This Ordinance amending Ordinance No. 1579 shall not become effective until written acceptance thereof shall have been filed by grantee with the City Clerk.

SECTION 3. All other terms, conditions, and provisions of Ordinance No. 1579, not amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.

First introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Richmond held May 2, 2023, and finally passed and adopted at a regular meeting held May 16, 2023, by the following vote:

AYES:	Councilmembers Bana, Jimenez, Robinson, Willis, Zepeda, Vice Mayor McLaughlin, and Mayor Martinez.
NOES:	None.
ABSTENTIONS:	None.
ABSENT:	None.

PAMELA CHRISTIAN
CLERK OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND
(SEAL)

Approved:

EDUARDO MARTINEZ
Mayor

Approved as to form:

DAVE ALESHIRE
City Attorney



State of California	}	
County of Contra Costa	}	: ss.
City of Richmond	}	

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of **Ordinance No. 05-23 N.S.**, passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Richmond at a regular meeting held on May 16, 2023.

Pamela Christian
Pamela Christian, Clerk of the City of Richmond

ACCEPTANCE

AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE NO. 1579

Pacific Gas and Electric Company hereby accepts and agrees to the Amendment to Ordinance No. 1579, and agrees to abide by and to be bound by all of its terms, conditions and provisions.

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: _____

By _____

Name:

Title:

Address:

ORDINANCE NO. 06-23 N.S.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 1580 WHICH GRANTED A FRANCHISE FOR THE TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF GAS WITHIN THE CITY OF RICHMOND TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY TO ADD A FRANCHISE FEE SURCHARGE

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND:

SECTION 1. Ordinance No. 1580, is amended to add a new Section 4.1, to be numbered and entitled and to read as follows:

SECTION 4.1

- (a) This amending Ordinance is granted upon the express condition of, and in exchange for, the commitment by grantee that grantee, as consideration therefore and as compensation for use of the streets of the City, as herein authorized and permitted shall pay to the City during the term (in addition to the franchise fees specified in Section 4) an additional one and three tenths per cent (1.3%) of the gross annual receipts of grantee (the "Franchise Fee Surcharge") from all gas utility customers served by grantee within the boundaries of the City. The customer collection shall be applied equally to grantee's gas utility customers based on the consumption or use of gas, including residential, commercial, industrial, government and wholesale customers, excluding those customers participating in grantee's California Alternative Rates for Energy (CARE) Program or successor low-income assistance program.
- (b) Prior to grantee's payment to City of the Franchise Fee Surcharge, grantee shall receive approval from the California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") to collect the Franchise Fee Surcharge in accordance with Commission Decision 89-05-063, *Guidelines for the Equitable Treatment of Revenue Producing Mechanisms Imposed by Local Government Entities on Public Utilities*, 32 CPUC2d 60, May 26, 1989.
- (c) The City shall cooperate with grantee in the preparation of any filings, data request responses or other approvals required for review of such approval.
- (d) If the Franchise Fee Surcharge is approved by the Commission, grantee shall implement customer billings of the Franchise Fee Surcharge as soon as reasonably possible thereafter.
- (e) The Franchise Fee Surcharge shall be remitted to the City on an annual basis, on or before the fifteenth (15th) day from and after the time for filing of the duly verified statement showing in detail the gross receipts of grantee during the prior calendar year or fractional calendar year.
- (f) In the event that any modification or repeal of the Franchise Fee Surcharge is issued by the CPUC, or in the event that the CPUC issues any order or decision that conflicts with grantee's collection of the Franchise Fee Surcharge, or in the event that any changes in law or ruling in accordance with law negates the imposition or collection of the Franchise Fee Surcharge, then grantee shall reduce or eliminate collection of the Franchise Fee Surcharge in an amount that corresponds to the change resulting from the CPUC's orders, actions, decisions, or as a result of any ruling or change in law. Grantee shall make a corresponding reduction in the Franchise Fee Surcharge paid to the City as part of franchise fee due in annual period thereafter.

SECTION 2. This Ordinance amending Ordinance No. 1580 shall not become effective until written acceptance thereof shall have been filed by grantee with the City Clerk.

SECTION 3. All other terms, conditions, and provisions of Ordinance No. 1580, not amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.

First introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Richmond held May 2, 2023, and finally passed and adopted at a regular meeting held May 16, 2023, by the following vote:

AYES:	Councilmembers Bana, Jimenez, Robinson, Willis, Zepeda, Vice Mayor McLaughlin, and Mayor Martinez.
NOES:	None.
ABSTENTIONS:	None.
ABSENT:	None.

PAMELA CHRISTIAN
CLERK OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND
(SEAL)

Approved:

EDUARDO MARTINEZ
Mayor

Approved as to form:

DAVE ALESHIRE
City Attorney



State of California	}	
County of Contra Costa	}	: ss.
City of Richmond	}	

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of **Ordinance No. 06-23 N.S.**, passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Richmond at a regular meeting held on May 16, 2023.


Pamela Christian, Clerk of the City of Richmond

ACCEPTANCE

AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE NO. 1580

Pacific Gas and Electric Company hereby accepts and agrees to the Amendment to Ordinance No. 1580, and agrees to abide by and to be bound by all of its terms, conditions and provisions.

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: _____

By _____

Name:

Title:

Address:

**PG&E Gas and Electric
Advice Submittal List
General Order 96-B, Section IV**

AT&T	East Bay Community Energy Ellison	Pioneer Community Energy
Albion Power Company	Schneider & Harris LLP	Public Advocates Office
	Engineers and Scientists of California	
Alta Power Group, LLC		Redwood Coast Energy Authority
Anderson & Poole	GenOn Energy, Inc.	Regulatory & Cogeneration Service, Inc.
	Green Power Institute	
Atlas ReFuel	Hanna & Morton	Resource Innovations
BART	ICF	
	iCommLaw	SCD Energy Solutions
Barkovich & Yap, Inc.	International Power Technology	San Diego Gas & Electric Company
Braun Blaising Smith Wynne, P.C.	Intertie	
California Community Choice Association	Intestate Gas Services, Inc.	SPURR
California Cotton Ginners & Growers Assn		San Francisco Water Power and Sewer
California Energy Commission		Sempra Utilities
	Johnston, Kevin	Sierra Telephone Company, Inc.
California Hub for Energy Efficiency	Kelly Group	Southern California Edison Company
Financing	Ken Bohn Consulting	Southern California Gas Company
	Keyes & Fox LLP	Spark Energy
California Alternative Energy and	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Sun Light & Power
Advanced Transportation Financing		Sunshine Design
Authority	Los Angeles County Integrated	Stoel Rives LLP
California Public Utilities Commission	Waste Management Task Force	
Calpine	MRW & Associates	
	Manatt Phelps Phillips	Tecogen, Inc.
Cameron-Daniel, P.C.	Marin Energy Authority	TerraVerde Renewable Partners
Casner, Steve	McClintock IP	Tiger Natural Gas, Inc.
Center for Biological Diversity	McKenzie & Associates	
	Modesto Irrigation District	TransCanada
Chevron Pipeline and Power	NRG Solar	Utility Cost Management
City of Palo Alto		Utility Power Solutions
	OnGrid Solar	Water and Energy Consulting Wellhead
City of San Jose	Pacific Gas and Electric Company	Electric Company
Clean Power Research	Peninsula Clean Energy	Western Manufactured Housing
Coast Economic Consulting		Communities Association (WMA)
Commercial Energy		Yep Energy
Crossborder Energy		
Crown Road Energy, LLC		
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP		
Day Carter Murphy		
Dept of General Services		
Don Pickett & Associates, Inc.		
Douglass & Liddell		
Downey Brand LLP		
Dish Wireless L.L.C.		