



California ISO  
Your Link to Power

California Independent  
System Operator Corporation

August 2, 2010

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: *California Independent System Operator Corporation*  
Docket No. ER10-2079-000  
**Errata to Transmission Access Charge Informational Filing**

Dear Secretary Bose:

On July 30, 2010, the California Independent System Operator Corporation submitted an informational filing in the above-referenced docket to provide notice regarding the ISO's revised transmission access charges effective July 1, 2009, August 1, 2009, September 1, 2009, October 1, 2009, January 1, 2010, March 1, 2010, and June 1, 2010. Subsequently, the ISO discovered that it had attached duplicate copies of Attachment A and the cover sheets for Attachments B-H to that filing. To avoid confusion for reviewers of this filing, the ISO is submitting in this errata filing a revised version of the filing removing the duplicate information.

The ISO has served copies of this transmittal letter and the attachment hereto on the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, the California Energy Commission, and the participating transmission owners, and on all parties with effective Scheduling Coordinator Agreements under the ISO tariff. In addition, the ISO is posting this transmittal letter and the attachment on the ISO's website.

If there are any questions concerning this filing, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**/s/ Michael D. Dozier**

Michael D. Dozier  
Senior Counsel  
California Independent System  
Operator Corporation  
151 Blue Ravine Road  
Folsom, CA 95630  
Tel: (916) 608-7048  
e-mail: mdozier@caiso.com

July 30, 2010

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: *California Independent System Operator Corporation*  
Docket No. ER10-\_\_\_\_\_-000

**Transmission Access Charge Informational Filing**

Dear Secretary Bose:

The California Independent System Operator Corporation submits an informational filing to provide notice regarding the ISO's revised transmission access charges (TAC) effective July 1, 2009, August 1, 2009, September 1, 2009, October 1, 2009, January 1, 2010, March 1, 2010, and June 1, 2010.<sup>1</sup> The basis for these revisions is to implement revised transmission revenue requirements (TRRs) of the cities of Riverside, Vernon, and Pasadena, California, Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), to implement the annual revision to the ISO's TAC transition charge, and to implement the annual transmission revenue balancing account (TRBA) adjustments of all the ISO's participating transmission owners.<sup>2</sup> This filing consolidates notice of several revisions to the ISO's TAC rates based on a number of Commission orders issued during the past several months. This filing also describes the ISO's efforts to provide refunds associated with revisions to TAC rates required by the Commission's orders. Each of these Commission orders and its effect on the ISO's TAC rates is described separately below.

---

<sup>1</sup> This filing is submitted in compliance with Order No. 714, *Electronic Tariff Filings*, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,276 (2009). Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein have the meanings set forth in Appendix A of the ISO tariff. The ISO is also sometimes referred to as the CAISO.

<sup>2</sup> The participating transmission owners with TRBAs are PG&E, SCE, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, the Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Pasadena, Riverside, and Vernon, California, Atlantic Path 15, LLC, and Startrans IO, L.L.C.

## **I. TAC Rates Orders and ISO Implementation**

### **A. City of Riverside Revised TRR Effective July 1, 2009**

The Commission initially accepted a revision to the city of Riverside's TRR, subject to hearing and settlement judge procedures, in an order issued on August 28, 2009 in Docket No. EL09-52.<sup>3</sup> The ISO was able to incorporate that TRR revision into the ISO's standard settlement process for its TAC rates as of the July 1, 2009 effective date ordered by the Commission. The ISO notified the Commission of the revisions of its TAC rates effective as of that date in an informational filing on December 22, 2009 in Docket No. ER10-466, together with notice of other TAC rates revisions. The Commission acknowledged that filing in a letter order issued on February 17, 2010.

In the meantime, Riverside filed a settlement in Docket No. EL09-52 revising its TRR effective retroactive to July 1, 2009, and the Commission issued an order on February 5, 2010 approving that settlement.<sup>4</sup> Along with notice of other changes in the ISO's TAC rates, today's informational filing provides notice of the ISO's revised TAC rates effective as of July 1, 2009 reflecting the settlement approved by the Commission in the order issued on February 5, 2010 in Docket No. EL09-52.

The timing of the Commission's order on the settlement in Docket No. EL09-52 was such that the ISO was only able to incorporate the revised TRR of Riverside into its standard settlement process for its TAC rates for the month of November 2009 and subsequent months, even though the revisions to Riverside's TRR were retroactive to July 1, 2009. In the ISO's informational filings on December 11, 2009 in Docket No. ER10-413 and on December 22, 2009 in Docket No. ER10-466, the ISO advised the Commission that it had not at that time determined the manner by which it would be able to provide any required refunds for the months of April through October 2009, as these refunds pertain to operations under its new settlements software system.

As the ISO advised in its prior filings, the ISO's new settlements software program does not have functionality to permit the processing of recalculated settlements for TAC refunds independent of the substantial backlog of other settlements recalculations that the ISO needs to process for the period since it implemented its new settlements software program on March 31, 2009. As a result, the ISO has not been able to issue any invoices for TAC refunds for the months of April-October 2009, including the TAC refunds associated with the settlement of the Riverside TRR approved by the Commission in Docket No. EL09-52 for the months of July-October 2009. After extensive evaluation and consultation with stakeholders whether an alternative approach to the implementation of the required refunds for the months of April-October 2009 could be developed, the ISO determined that the implementation of these refunds needed to await the completion of all other settlements recalculations for

---

<sup>3</sup> *City of Riverside, California*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,207 (2009).

<sup>4</sup> *City of Riverside, California*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,094 (2010).

the post-March 31, 2009 period and that additional provisions needed to be added to its tariff to provide a process for implementation of these recalculations.

As a result of these evaluations, the ISO developed a tariff amendment to facilitate the implementation of the necessary settlements recalculations and filed that amendment on July 8, 2010 in Docket No. ER10-1735. Once the Commission has accepted that tariff amendment, the ISO will implement the TAC refunds for the period from April 1 through October 31, 2009, including the refunds associated with the revised Riverside TRR for the months of July-October 2009. This informational filing provides notice to the Commission of the ISO's intent to implement those refunds in accordance with the provisions of that tariff amendment.

### **B. City of Pasadena Revised TRR Effective October 1, 2009**

The Commission initially accepted a revision to the city of Pasadena's TRR, subject to hearing and settlement judge procedures, in an order issued on September 30, 2009 in Docket No. EL09-67.<sup>5</sup> The ISO was able to incorporate that TRR revision into the ISO's standard settlement process for its TAC rates as of the October 1, 2009 effective date ordered by the Commission. The ISO notified the Commission of the revisions of its TAC rates effective as of that date in the ISO's informational filing on December 22, 2009 in Docket No. ER10-466, together with notice of other TAC rates revisions. The Commission acknowledged that filing in a letter order issued on February 17, 2010.

In the meantime, Pasadena filed a settlement in Docket No. EL09-67 revising its TRR effective retroactive to October 1, 2009, and the Commission issued an order on February 22, 2010 approving that settlement.<sup>6</sup> Along with notice of other changes in the ISO's TAC rates, today's informational filing provides notice of the ISO's revised TAC rates effective as of October 1, 2009 reflecting the settlement approved by the Commission in the order issued on February 22, 2010 in Docket No. EL09-67.

The timing of the Commission's order on the settlement in Docket No. EL09-67 was such that the ISO was only able to incorporate the revised TRR of Pasadena into its standard settlement process for its TAC rates for the month of November 2009 and subsequent months, even though the revisions to Pasadena's TRR were retroactive to October 1, 2009. (Note that, due to the timing of the ISO's issuance of invoices pursuant to its current tariff provisions in relation to the timing of the Commission's order on the settlement in Docket No. EL09-67, the TAC refunds for Pasadena's revised TRR for the month of November 2009 associated with its settlement will be implemented in a future invoice.)

---

<sup>5</sup> *City of Pasadena, California*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,290 (2009).

<sup>6</sup> *City of Pasadena, California*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,129 (2010).

Section I.A above explains how the ISO has previously advised the Commission of the ISO's inability to issue any invoices for TAC refunds for the months of April-October 2009, including the TAC refunds associated with the settlement of the Pasadena TRR approved by the Commission in Docket No. EL09-67 for the month of October 2009, and the ISO's development of a tariff amendment filed in Docket No. ER10-1735 to facilitate the implementation of the necessary settlements recalculations. Once the Commission has accepted that tariff amendment, the ISO will implement the TAC refunds for the period from April 1 through October 31, 2009, including the refunds associated with the revised Pasadena TRR for the month of October 2009. This informational filing provides notice to the Commission of the ISO's intent to implement those refunds in accordance with the provisions of that tariff amendment.

### **C. City of Vernon Revised TRR Effective January 1, 2010**

The Commission accepted the revision to the City of Vernon's TRR in an order issued on September 11, 2009 in Docket No. EL09-64.<sup>7</sup> The ISO was able to incorporate that TRR revision into the ISO's standard settlement process for its TAC rates as of the August 1, 2009 effective date ordered by the Commission. The ISO notified the Commission of the revisions of its TAC rates effective as of that date in the ISO's informational filing on December 22, 2009 in Docket No. ER10-466, together with notice of other TAC rates revisions. The Commission acknowledged that filing in a letter order issued on February 17, 2010.

In the September 11, 2009 order, the Commission directed Vernon to file an annual update to its TRR. Vernon filed that update in Docket No. EL10-10, and the Commission issued a letter order on January 8, 2010 accepting Vernon's revised TRR effective as of January 1, 2010. Along with notice of other changes in the ISO's TAC rates, today's informational filing provides notice of the ISO's revised TAC rates effective as of January 1, 2010 reflecting the revised Vernon TRR accepted by the Commission in the order issued on January 8, 2010 in Docket No. EL10-10.

### **D. TRBA Adjustments Effective January 1, 2010**

The docket numbers of the filings of the participating transmission owners updating their respective TRRs to account for their TRBA adjustments are provided in Attachment A to this informational filing. In each proceeding, the Commission issued a letter order accepting the requested TRBA adjustment effective as of January 1, 2010. Vernon filed its TRBA adjustment together with its TRR revision described in Section I.C above, and the Commission accepted the TRBA adjustment in the same January 8, 2010 letter order that it accepted Vernon's TRR revision. Along with notice of other changes in the ISO's TAC rates, today's informational filing provides notice of the ISO's revised TAC rates effective as of January 1, 2010 reflecting the TRBA adjustments accepted by the Commission in the orders in the dockets listed in Attachment A.

---

<sup>7</sup> *City of Vernon, California*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,235 (2009).

#### **E. Annual TAC Transition Charge Revision Effective January 1, 2010**

Sections 4.2, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, and 7 of Schedule 3 of Appendix F of the ISO tariff when read together provide that the transition charge associated with the TAC will be revised annually for the ten-year TAC transition period until it is no longer applicable. Pursuant to those tariff provisions, the ISO revised the TAC transition charge effective as of January 1, 2010. Along with notice of other changes in the ISO's TAC rates, today's informational filing provides notice of the ISO's revised TAC rates effective as of January 1, 2010 reflecting the revised transition charge. This is the final year of the ten-year TAC transition period. In recognition that the administration of the TAC will change as of next year, the ISO intends to make a future filing of tariff revisions to clarify or delete tariff provisions regarding the TAC transition charge for the year 2011 and subsequent years.

#### **F. SCE Revised TRR Effective March 1, 2010**

On July 31, 2009, SCE filed a revised TRR in Docket No. ER09-1534. On September 30, 2009, the Commission accepted the filing, subject to refund, effective as of March 1, 2010.<sup>8</sup> In addition, on January 28, 2010, SCE filed a further revision to its TRR in Docket No. ER10-665 to be effective as of March 1, 2010. On March 12, 2010, the Commission issued a letter order accepting this further TRR revision. Along with notice of other changes in the ISO's TAC rates, today's informational filing provides notice of the ISO's revised TAC rates effective as of March 1, 2010 reflecting the revised SCE TRR accepted by the Commission in the order issued on September 30, 2009 in Docket No. ER09-1534, as further revised pursuant to the letter order issued on March 12, 2010.

#### **G. PG&E Revised TRR Effective March 1, 2010**

On July 30, 2009, PG&E filed a revised TRR in Docket No. ER09-1521. On September 30, 2009, the Commission accepted the filing, subject to refund, effective as of March 1, 2010.<sup>9</sup> On March 31, 2010, PG&E filed an offer of settlement revising its TRR effective retroactive to March 1, 2010. On April 8, 2010, the Chief Judge of the Commission issued an order authorizing PG&E to institute its revised TRR on an interim basis effective as of March 1, 2010 for wholesale customers, to remain effective until a Commission order on the offer of settlement. On July 27, 2010, the Commission issued a letter order approving this settlement.<sup>10</sup> Along with notice of other changes in the ISO's TAC rates, today's informational filing provides notice of the ISO's revised TAC rates effective as of March 1, 2010 reflecting the revised PG&E TRR accepted by the Commission in the order issued on September 30, 2009 in Docket No. ER09-1521, as further revised by the order of the Commission issued on July 27, 2010.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Southern California Edison Company*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,287 (2009).

<sup>9</sup> *Pacific Gas and Electric Company*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,288 (2009).

<sup>10</sup> *Pacific Gas and Electric Company*, 132 FERC ¶ 61,073 (2010).

The ISO originally issued invoices for the revised TAC rates as of March 1, 2010 associated with PG&E's revised TRR initially accepted by the Commission and SCE's revised TRR accepted by the Commission as described in Section I.F above. However, the ISO subsequently issued invoices for revised TAC rates associated with PG&E's revised TRR effective as of March 1, 2010 based on the interim order on PG&E's offer of settlement, which revised TRR was approved in the July 27, 2010 order. As the revised TAC rates reflecting PG&E's revised TRR are the most current and have been invoiced, the ISO has provided notice only of those currently-effective TAC rates as of March 1, 2010 in this informational filing.

#### **H. SCE Revised TRR Effective June 1, 2010**

On October 30, 2009, SCE filed a revised TRR in Docket No. ER10-160. On December 31, 2009, the Commission accepted the filing, subject to refund, effective as of June 1, 2010.<sup>11</sup> Along with notice of other changes in the ISO's TAC rates, today's informational filing provides notice of the ISO's revised TAC rates effective as of June 1, 2010 reflecting the revised SCE TRR accepted by the Commission in the order issued on December 31, 2009 in Docket No. ER10-160.

#### **I. Other TAC Refunds for the Period April 1-October 31, 2009**

In the ISO's informational filings on December 11, 2009 in Docket No. ER10-413 and on December 22, 2009 in Docket No. ER10-466, the ISO advised the Commission of its revised TAC rates reflecting SCE's revised TRR for the period from March 1, 2009 through March 31, 2009 and the TAC refunds that the ISO has provided associated with the revised SCE TRR. In those filings, the ISO also advised the Commission that the ISO had yet to determine the manner by which it would be able to provide the required refunds for the months of April, May, and June 2009 for SCE (and for the month of April 2009 for Startrans IO, LLC and Atlantic Path 15, LLC), as these refunds pertain to operations under its new settlements software system.

As described in Section I.A above and in the ISO's prior filings, the ISO's new settlements software program lacked the functionality to permit the processing of recalculated settlements for TAC refunds independent of the substantial backlog of other settlements recalculations that the ISO needs to process for the period since it implemented its new settlements software program on March 31, 2009. As a result, the ISO was not able to issue an invoice for TAC refunds owed by SCE for the months of April, May, and June 2009 (or for Startrans or Atlantic Path 15 for April 2009). After extensive evaluation whether an alternative approach to the implementation of the required refunds for the months of April, May, and June 2009 could be developed, the ISO determined that the implementation of these refunds needed to await the completion of all other settlements recalculations for the post-March 31, 2009 period.

---

<sup>11</sup> *Southern California Edison Company*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,304 (2009).

As a result of these evaluations, the ISO developed the tariff amendment filed in Docket No. ER10-1735 and described in Section I.A above to facilitate the implementation of the necessary settlements recalculations. Once the Commission has accepted that tariff amendment, the ISO will implement the TAC refunds for the period from April 1 through October 31, 2009, including those associated with the revised Startrans, Atlantic Path 15, and SCE TRRs approved in ER08-413, ER08-374 and EL08-38, and ER08-1343 *et al.* This informational filing provides notice to the Commission of the ISO's intent to implement those refunds in accordance with the provisions of that tariff amendment.

## II. Changes in TAC Rates

The TAC rates provided in the present filing revise the access charges and wheeling access charges provided for informational purposes by the ISO in Docket No. ER10-466 (deemed by the Commission as filed on December 22, 2009). Pursuant to the Commission orders in Docket Nos. EL09-52, EL09-64, EL09-67, ER09-1521, ER09-1534, ER10-665, and ER10-160, and the docket numbers listed in Attachment A, the changes in the present filing are effective for the dates set forth below, in accordance with CAISO Tariff Appendix F, Schedule 3, Section 8.

Worksheets illustrating the calculation of the CAISO's TAC rates are included with the present transmittal letter as Attachments B-H. The rates for each of the TAC Areas effective July 1, 2009 through July 31, 2009 are reflected in Attachment B and are as follows:

Northern Area	\$3.9108/MWh
East/Central Area	\$3.9849/MWh
Southern Area	\$3.9755/MWh

The rates for each of the TAC Areas effective August 1, 2009 through August 31, 2009 are reflected in Attachment C and are as follows:

Northern Area	\$3.9115/MWh
East/Central Area	\$3.9856/MWh
Southern Area	\$3.9762/MWh

The rates for each of the TAC Areas effective September 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009 are reflected in Attachment D and are as follows:

Northern Area	\$3.8183/MWh
East/Central Area	\$3.8924/MWh
Southern Area	\$3.8251/MWh

The rates for each of the TAC Areas effective October 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009 are reflected in Attachment E and are as follows:

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose

July 30, 2010

Page 8

Northern Area	\$3.8275/MWh
East/Central Area	\$3.9040/MWh
Southern Area	\$3.8343/MWh

The rates for each of the TAC Areas effective January 1, 2010 through February 28, 2010 are reflected in Attachment F and are as follows:

Northern Area	\$4.3587/MWh
East/Central Area	\$4.3587/MWh
Southern Area	\$4.3587/MWh

The rates for each of the TAC Areas effective March 1, 2010 through May 31, 2010 are reflected in Attachment G and are as follows:

Northern Area	\$5.0939/MWh
East/Central Area	\$5.0939/MWh
Southern Area	\$5.0939/MWh

The rates for each of the TAC Areas effective June 1, 2010 are reflected in Attachment H and are as follows:

Northern Area	\$5.1299/MWh
East/Central Area	\$5.1299/MWh
Southern Area	\$5.1299/MWh

### III. Communications

Communications regarding this filing should be addressed to the following individual, whose name should be placed on the official service list established by the Secretary with respect to this submittal:

Michael D. Dozier,* Senior Counsel
California Independent System Operator Corporation
151 Blue Ravine Road
Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (916) 608-7048
Fax: (916) 608-7222
e-mail: <a href="mailto:mdozier@caiso.com">mdozier@caiso.com</a>

\*Individual designated for service pursuant to Rule 203(b)(3), 18 C.F.R. § 385.203(b)(3).

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose

July 30, 2010

Page 9

#### **IV. Service**

The ISO has served copies of this transmittal letter and attachments hereto on the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, the California Energy Commission, and the participating transmission owners, and on all parties with effective Scheduling Coordinator Agreements under the ISO tariff. In addition, the ISO is posting this transmittal letter and all attachments on the ISO's website.

If there are any questions concerning this filing, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**/s/ Michael D. Dozier**

Michael D. Dozier

Senior Counsel

California Independent System

Operator Corporation

151 Blue Ravine Road

Folsom, CA 95630

Tel: (916) 608-7048

Fax: (916) 608-7222

e-mail: [mdozier@caiso.com](mailto:mdozier@caiso.com)

Attachments

## ATTACHMENT A

## ATTACHMENT A

### Participating Transmission Owners' 2010 TRBA Adjustment Filings

PTO	Docket No.	Date of Filing	Date of Order
Pacific Gas and Electric Company	ER10-36-000	10/06/09	12/4/09
Southern California Edison Company	ER10-135-000	10/29/2009	12/29/09
Atlantic Path 15, LLC	ER10-139-000 ER10-139-001 ER10-139-002	10/29/2009 [revised 12/7/09 and 12/14/09]	1/13/10
City of Vernon	EL10-10-000 EL10-10-001	10/30/2009 [corrected 11/20/09]	1/8/10
Startrans IO, L.L.C.	ER10-318-000	11/24/10	1/13/10
San Diego Gas & Electric Company	ER10-467-000	12/22/09	2/17/10
City of Anaheim	EL10-25-000 EL10-25-001	12/22/09 [corrected 12/30/09]	2/25/10
City of Riverside	EL10-26-000	12/22/09	2/12/10
City of Banning	EL10-28-000	12/23/09	1/26/10
City of Azusa	EL10-30-000	12/30/09	1/28/10
City of Pasadena	EL10-31-000	12/30/09	2/23/10

ATTACHMENT B

## July 01, 2009 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

Based on the FERC Order on City of Riverside's Offer of Settlement (Docket No. EL09-52)

**TAC Components:**

	Filed Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [1]	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [2]	Filed Annual Gross Load (MWh) [3]	TAC Area [4]	Total Filed TRR (\$) = [1] + [2] [5]	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [6] = [1] / [3]	EHVF only TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [7] = [2] [1]	HV Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [8] = [5] / [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [9] = [19]
PGE	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 166,550,793	94,466,738	N	\$ 301,443,169	\$ 1.4279	\$ 1.7753	\$ 3.1910	\$ 3.9108
SCE	\$ 162,666,933	\$ 193,107,640	92,450,710	EC	\$ 355,774,573	\$ 1.7595	\$ 1.8447	\$ 3.8483	\$ 3.9849
SDGE	\$ 44,809,755	\$ 70,036,379	21,596,392	S	\$ 114,846,134	\$ 2.0749	\$ 1.8400	\$ 5.3178	\$ 3.9755
Anaheim	\$ 20,212,164	\$ -	2,766,313	EC	\$ 20,212,164	\$ 7.3065	\$ 1.8447	\$ 7.3065	\$ 3.9849
Azusa	\$ 1,226,554	\$ -	239,575	EC	\$ 1,226,554	\$ 5.1197	\$ 1.8447	\$ 5.1197	\$ 3.9849
Banning	\$ 930,800	\$ -	139,457	EC	\$ 930,800	\$ 6.6745	\$ 1.8447	\$ 6.6745	\$ 3.9849
Pasadena	\$ 6,796,373	\$ -	1,239,884	EC	\$ 6,796,373	\$ 5.4815	\$ 1.8447	\$ 5.4815	\$ 3.9849
Riverside	\$ 19,774,824	\$ -	2,201,147	EC	\$ 19,774,824	\$ 8.9839	\$ 1.8447	\$ 8.9839	\$ 3.9849
Vernon	\$ 1,204,988	\$ -	1,288,684	EC	\$ 1,204,988	\$ 0.9351	\$ 1.8447	\$ 0.9351	\$ 3.9849
Atlantic P15	\$ -	\$ 28,118,790	-	N	\$ 28,118,790	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3.9108
Startrans	\$ 4,760,375	\$ -	-	EC	\$ 4,760,375	\$ -	\$ 1.8447	\$ -	\$ 3.9849
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>\$ 397,275,141</b>	<b>\$ 457,813,602</b>	<b>216,388,900</b>		<b>\$ 855,088,743</b>				

**STEP 1: Calculate the Access Charge Rate for each TAC Area.**

TAC-Area portion is the percent of Total TRR in each area which has not yet transitioned to the ISO (10%) divided by the Total Load of each area.  
The ISO portion is the percent of all TRR which has transitioned to ISO-Wide (90%), plus the TRR of New HV Facilities, divided by total load.

	Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [10] = [1]	Annual TAC Area TRR (\$) [11] = [10] x 10%	Annual TAC Area TRR (w/Load) (\$) [11B] = ([10] w/Load) x 10%	Annual Gross Load (MWh) [12] = [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [13] = [11] / [12]	TAC Area Rate (TRR w/Load) (\$/MWh) [13B] = [11B] / [12]																							
North	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 13,489,238	\$ 13,489,238	94,466,738	\$ 0.1428	\$ 0.1428	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]</th> <th>Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]</th> <th>Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [[13B]] + [18]</th> <th>New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>North</td> <td>\$ 3.9108</td> <td>\$ 3.9108</td> <td>\$ 1.7753</td> <td>\$ 2.1157</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East/Central</td> <td>\$ 3.9849</td> <td>\$ 3.9849</td> <td>\$ 1.8447</td> <td>\$ 2.1157</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South</td> <td>\$ 3.9755</td> <td>\$ 3.9755</td> <td>\$ 1.8400</td> <td>\$ 2.1157</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [[13B]] + [18]	New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]	North	\$ 3.9108	\$ 3.9108	\$ 1.7753	\$ 2.1157	East/Central	\$ 3.9849	\$ 3.9849	\$ 1.8447	\$ 2.1157	South	\$ 3.9755	\$ 3.9755	\$ 1.8400	\$ 2.1157		
	TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [[13B]] + [18]	New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]																									
North	\$ 3.9108	\$ 3.9108	\$ 1.7753	\$ 2.1157																									
East/Central	\$ 3.9849	\$ 3.9849	\$ 1.8447	\$ 2.1157																									
South	\$ 3.9755	\$ 3.9755	\$ 1.8400	\$ 2.1157																									
East/C	\$ 217,573,010	\$ 21,757,301	\$ 21,281,264	100,325,770	\$ 0.2169	\$ 0.2121																							
South	\$ 44,809,755	\$ 4,480,976	\$ 4,480,976	21,596,392	\$ 0.2075	\$ 0.2075																							
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 397,275,141</b>	<b>\$ 39,727,514</b>	<b>\$ 39,251,477</b>	<b>216,388,900</b>																									
	ISO Wide TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [14] Total ([10]) x 90%	ISO Wide TRR EHVf w/Load (\$) [14B] Total ([10] w/Load) x 90%	ISO Wide TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [15] = Total [2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [16] = Total [3]	ISO Wide Rate (\$/MWh) [17] = ([14] + [15]) / [16]	EHVF ISO-Wide Rate TRR w/Load only (\$/MWh) [18] = [14B] / [16]																							
<b>ISO-wide</b>	<b>\$ 357,547,627</b>	<b>\$ 353,263,290</b>	<b>\$ 457,813,602</b>	<b>216,388,900</b>	<b>\$ 3.7680</b>	<b>\$ 1.6325</b>																							

## July 01, 2009 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 2: Calculate the HV Access Charge the UDC/MSS pays on Filed Gross Load and Benefit/Burden.** Note: ISO total for (Benefit)/Burden may not equal zero due to rounding of TAC Rate.

TAC Area		Filed Gross Load (MWH)	EHV only TAC Rate (\$/MWH)	Amount Paid Based on Filed Gross Load (\$)	EHV only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH)	Would Have Paid w/ EHV Utility Specific Rate (\$)	EHV Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)
		[23] =[4]	[25] =[7]	[26] =[24] x [25]	[27] =[6]	[28] =[24] x [27]	[29] =[26] - [28]
PGE	N	94,466,738	\$ 1.7753	\$ 167,709,859	\$ 1.4279	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 32,817,483
SCE	EC	92,450,710	\$ 1.8447	\$ 170,540,171	\$ 1.7595	\$ 162,666,933	\$ 7,873,238
SDGE	S	21,596,392	\$ 1.8400	\$ 39,737,925	\$ 2.0749	\$ 44,809,755	\$ (5,071,830)
Anaheim	EC	2,766,313	\$ 1.8447	\$ 5,102,908	\$ 7.3065	\$ 20,212,164	\$ (15,109,256)
Azusa	EC	239,575	\$ 1.8447	\$ 441,935	\$ 5.1197	\$ 1,226,554	\$ (784,619)
Banning	EC	139,457	\$ 1.8447	\$ 257,251	\$ 6.6745	\$ 930,800	\$ (673,549)
Pasadena	EC	1,239,884	\$ 1.8447	\$ 2,287,165	\$ 5.4815	\$ 6,796,373	\$ (4,509,208)
Riverside	EC	2,201,147	\$ 1.8447	\$ 4,060,369	\$ 8.9839	\$ 19,774,824	\$ (15,714,455)
Vernon	EC	1,288,684	\$ 1.8447	\$ 2,377,184	\$ 0.9351	\$ 1,204,988	\$ 1,172,196
Startrans	EC	-	\$ 1.8447	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>ISO Total</b>		<b>216,388,900</b>		<b>\$ 392,514,766</b>		<b>\$ 392,514,766</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>

**STEP 3: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for Existing Facilities.**

\$32/32/8 million cap for IOUs; munis are held harmless; IOUs pay muni cost increases in proportion to their cap relative to the total cap.

	EHV Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [30] =[29]	IOU Burden Annual Cap (\$) [31]	Amount IOUs' Cap Exceeds IOUs' Burden (\$) [32] IF ([31] - [30] > 0) = [31] - [30]. If no cap, then 0.	Amount IOU's Burden Exceeds IOU's Cap (\$) [33] IF [30] - [31] > 0 = [30] - [31]. If no cap, then 0.	Payments by Entities with Net Benefit (\$) [34] IOUs = ((32) / total(32)) x total(33). Munis w/ Benefit= ([30] / total(30)) x total(33) - total(32)	Mitigation Payments (\$) [35] = [34] - [33]	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$) [36] = [30] + [35]	Reallocation IOU Burden (\$) [37] Reallocate IOU Burden [39] so it is proportional to IOU Cap [31] = [39] - [36]	Transition Charge (\$) [38] = [35] + [37]	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$) [39] = [36] + [37]	Transition Charge Rate (\$/MWh) [40] = [38] / [24]
PGE	\$ 32,817,483	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 817,483.0694	\$ 0	\$ (817,483)	\$ 32,000,000	\$ (15,648,406)	\$ (16,465,889)	\$ 16,351,594	\$ (0.1743)
SCE	\$ 7,873,238	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 24,126,762	\$ 0	\$ 1,290,493	\$ 1,290,493	\$ 9,163,731	\$ 7,187,864	\$ 8,478,357	\$ 16,351,594	\$ 0.0917
SDGE	\$ (5,071,830)	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 13,071,830	\$ 0	\$ 699,186	\$ 699,186	\$ (4,372,644)	\$ 8,460,542	\$ 9,159,729	\$ 4,087,899	\$ 0.4241
Anaheim	\$ (15,109,256)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,109,256)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,109,256)	\$ 0
Azusa	\$ (784,619)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (784,619)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (784,619)	\$ 0
Banning	\$ (673,549)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (673,549)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (673,549)	\$ 0
Pasadena	\$ (4,509,208)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (4,509,208)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (4,509,208)	\$ 0
Riverside	\$ (15,714,455)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,714,455)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,714,455)	\$ 0
Vernon	\$ 1,172,196	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,172,196	\$ 0	\$ (1,172,196)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,172,196)	\$ 0	\$ (0.9096)
Startrans	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 72,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 37,198,593</b>	<b>\$ 1,989,680</b>	<b>\$ 1,989,680</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## July 01, 2009 TAC Rates

### Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 4: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for New Facilities and Total projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge.**

	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [41] =[2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [42] =[3]	New HVTRR Rate (\$/MWh) [43] =[15]/[16]	New HVTRR Cost Responsibility (\$) [44] =[42] * [43]	NHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [45] =[44] - [41]	Total Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [46] =[45] + [39]
PGE	\$ 166,550,793	94,466,738	\$ 2.1157	\$ 199,863,106	\$ 33,312,313	\$ 49,663,907
SCE	\$ 193,107,640	92,450,710	\$ 2.1157	\$ 195,597,799	\$ 2,490,159	\$ 18,841,753
SDGE	\$ 70,036,379	21,596,392	\$ 2.1157	\$ 45,691,447	\$ (24,344,932)	\$ (20,257,033)
Anaheim	\$ -	2,766,313	\$ 2.1157	\$ 5,852,683	\$ 5,852,683	\$ (9,256,573)
Azusa	\$ -	239,575	\$ 2.1157	\$ 506,868	\$ 506,868	\$ (277,751)
Banning	\$ -	139,457	\$ 2.1157	\$ 295,049	\$ 295,049	\$ (378,500)
Pasadena	\$ -	1,239,884	\$ 2.1157	\$ 2,623,220	\$ 2,623,220	\$ (1,885,987)
Riverside	\$ -	2,201,147	\$ 2.1157	\$ 4,656,963	\$ 4,656,963	\$ (11,057,492)
Vernon	\$ -	1,288,684	\$ 2.1157	\$ 2,726,466	\$ 2,726,466	\$ 2,726,466
Atlantic P15	\$ 28,118,790	0	\$ 2.1157	\$ 0	\$ (28,118,790)	\$ (28,118,790)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 457,813,602</b>	<b>216,388,900</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$ 457,813,602</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## ATTACHMENT C

## August 01, 2009 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

Based on the FERC Order on City of Riverside's Offer of Settlement (Docket No. EL09-52)

**TAC Components:**

	Filed Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [1]	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [2]	Filed Annual Gross Load (MWh) [3]	TAC Area [4]	Total Filed TRR (\$) = [1] + [2] [5]	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH) [6] = [1] / [3]	EHVF only TAC Area Rate (\$/MWH) [7] = [2] [1]	HV Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH) [8] = [5] / [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWH) [9] = [19]
PGE	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 166,550,793	94,466,738	N	\$ 301,443,169	\$ 1.4279	\$ 1.7757	\$ 3.1910	\$ 3.9115
SCE	\$ 162,666,933	\$ 193,107,640	92,450,710	EC	\$ 355,774,573	\$ 1.7595	\$ 1.8451	\$ 3.8483	\$ 3.9856
SDGE	\$ 44,809,755	\$ 70,036,379	21,596,392	S	\$ 114,846,134	\$ 2.0749	\$ 1.8404	\$ 5.3178	\$ 3.9762
Anaheim	\$ 20,212,164	\$ -	2,766,313	EC	\$ 20,212,164	\$ 7.3065	\$ 1.8451	\$ 7.3065	\$ 3.9856
Azusa	\$ 1,226,554	\$ -	239,575	EC	\$ 1,226,554	\$ 5.1197	\$ 1.8451	\$ 5.1197	\$ 3.9856
Banning	\$ 930,800	\$ -	139,457	EC	\$ 930,800	\$ 6.6745	\$ 1.8451	\$ 6.6745	\$ 3.9856
Pasadena	\$ 6,796,373	\$ -	1,239,884	EC	\$ 6,796,373	\$ 5.4815	\$ 1.8451	\$ 5.4815	\$ 3.9856
Riverside	\$ 19,774,824	\$ -	2,201,147	EC	\$ 19,774,824	\$ 8.9839	\$ 1.8451	\$ 8.9839	\$ 3.9856
Vernon	\$ 1,231,199	\$ -	1,257,502	EC	\$ 1,231,199	\$ 0.9791	\$ 1.8451	\$ 0.9791	\$ 3.9856
Atlantic P15	\$ -	\$ 28,118,790	-	N	\$ 28,118,790	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3.9115
Startrans	\$ 4,760,375	\$ -	-	EC	\$ 4,760,375	\$ -	\$ 1.8451	\$ -	\$ 3.9856
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>\$ 397,301,352</b>	<b>\$ 457,813,602</b>	<b>216,357,718</b>		<b>\$ 855,114,954</b>				

**STEP 1: Calculate the Access Charge Rate for each TAC Area.**

TAC-Area portion is the percent of Total TRR in each area which has not yet transitioned to the ISO (10%) divided by the Total Load of each area.  
The ISO portion is the percent of all TRR which has transitioned to ISO-Wide (90%), plus the TRR of New HV Facilities, divided by total load.

	Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [10] = [1]	Annual TAC Area TRR (\$) [11] = [10] x 10%	Annual TAC Area TRR (w/Load) (\$) [11B] = ([10] w/Load) x 10%	Annual Gross Load (MWh) [12] = [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWH) [13] = [11] / [12]	TAC Area Rate (TRR w/Load) (\$/MWH) [13B] = [11B] / [12]					
North	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 13,489,238	\$ 13,489,238	94,466,738	\$ 0.1428	\$ 0.1428	<b>TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWH) [19] = [13] + [17]</b>	<b>Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWH) [20] = [19]</b>	<b>Existing HV Facilities only TAC Rate (\$/MWH) [21] = [13B] + [18]</b>	<b>New HV Facilities only TAC Rate (\$/MWH) [22] = [15] / [16]</b>	
East/C	\$ 217,599,221	\$ 21,759,922	\$ 21,283,885	100,294,588	\$ 0.2170	\$ 0.2122					
South	\$ 44,809,755	\$ 4,480,976	\$ 4,480,976	21,596,392	\$ 0.2075	\$ 0.2075					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 397,301,352</b>	<b>\$ 39,730,135</b>	<b>\$ 39,254,098</b>	<b>216,357,718</b>							
ISO Wide TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [14] Total ([10]) x 90%	ISO Wide TRR EHVF w/Load (\$) [14B] Total ([10] w/Load) x 90%	ISO Wide TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [15] = Total [2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [16] = Total [3]	ISO Wide Rate (\$/MWH) [17] = ([14] + [15]) / [16]	EHVF ISO-Wide Rate TRR w/Load only (\$/MWH) [18] = [14B] / [16]						
<b>ISO-wide</b>	<b>\$ 357,571,217</b>	<b>\$ 353,286,880</b>	<b>\$ 457,813,602</b>	<b>216,357,718</b>	<b>\$ 3.7687</b>	<b>\$ 1.6329</b>					
							<b>North</b>	<b>\$ 3.9115</b>	<b>\$ 3.9115</b>	<b>\$ 1.7757</b>	<b>\$ 2.1160</b>
							<b>East/Central</b>	<b>\$ 3.9856</b>	<b>\$ 3.9856</b>	<b>\$ 1.8451</b>	<b>\$ 2.1160</b>
							<b>South</b>	<b>\$ 3.9762</b>	<b>\$ 3.9762</b>	<b>\$ 1.8404</b>	<b>\$ 2.1160</b>

### August 01, 2009 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 2: Calculate the HV Access Charge the UDC/MSS pays on Filed Gross Load and Benefit/Burden.** Note: ISO total for (Benefit)/Burden may not equal zero due to rounding of TAC Rate.

TAC Area		Filed Gross Load (MWH)	EHVF only TAC Rate (\$/MWH)	Amount Paid Based on Filed Gross Load (\$)	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH)	Would Have Paid w/ EHVF Utility Specific Rate (\$)	EHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)
		[24] =[3]	[25] =[7]	[26] =[24] x [25]	[27] =[6]	[28] =[24] x [27]	[29] =[26] - [28]
PGE	N	94,466,738	\$ 1.7757	\$ 167,742,386	\$ 1.4279	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 32,850,010
SCE	EC	92,450,710	\$ 1.8451	\$ 170,580,516	\$ 1.7595	\$ 162,666,933	\$ 7,913,583
SDGE	S	21,596,392	\$ 1.8404	\$ 39,745,361	\$ 2.0749	\$ 44,809,755	\$ (5,064,394)
Anaheim	EC	2,766,313	\$ 1.8451	\$ 5,104,115	\$ 7.3065	\$ 20,212,164	\$ (15,108,049)
Azusa	EC	239,575	\$ 1.8451	\$ 442,039	\$ 5.1197	\$ 1,226,554	\$ (784,515)
Banning	EC	139,457	\$ 1.8451	\$ 257,312	\$ 6.6745	\$ 930,800	\$ (673,488)
Pasadena	EC	1,239,884	\$ 1.8451	\$ 2,287,706	\$ 5.4815	\$ 6,796,373	\$ (4,508,666)
Riverside	EC	2,201,147	\$ 1.8451	\$ 4,061,329	\$ 8.9839	\$ 19,774,824	\$ (15,713,495)
Vernon	EC	1,257,502	\$ 1.8451	\$ 2,320,213	\$ 0.9791	\$ 1,231,199	\$ 1,089,014
Startrans	EC	-	\$ 1.8451	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>ISO Total</b>		<b>216,357,718</b>		<b>\$ 392,540,977</b>		<b>\$ 392,540,977</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

**STEP 3: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for Existing Facilities.**

\$32/32/8 million cap for IOUs; munis are held harmless; IOUs pay muni cost increases in proportion to their cap relative to the total cap.

	EHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)	IOU Burden Annual Cap (\$)	Amount IOUs' Cap Exceeds IOUs' Burden (\$)	Amount IOU's Burden Exceeds IOU's Cap (\$)	Payments by Entities with Net Benefit (\$)	Mitigation Payments (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Reallocation IOU Burden (\$)	Transition Charge (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Transition Charge Rate (\$/MWh)
	[30] =[29]	[31]	[32] IF ([31] - [30] > 0) = [31] - [30]. If no cap, then 0.	[33] IF [30] - [31] > 0 = [30] - [31]. If no cap, then 0.	[34] IOUs = ([32] / total[32]) x total[33]. Munis w/ Benefit = ([30] / total[30]) x total[33] - total[32]	[35]	[36] = [30] + [35]	[37] Reallocate IOU Burden [39] so it is proportional to IOU Cap [31] = [39] - [36]	[38] = [35] + [37]	[39] = [36] + [37]	[40] = [38] / [24]
PGE	\$ 32,850,010	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 850,009,6110	\$ 0	\$ (850,010)	\$ 32,000,000	\$ (15,649,683)	\$ (16,499,693)	\$ 16,350,317	\$ (0.1747)
SCE	\$ 7,913,583	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 24,086,417	\$ 0	\$ 1,257,150	\$ 1,257,150	\$ 9,170,733	\$ 7,179,584	\$ 8,436,734	\$ 16,350,317	\$ 0.0913
SDGE	\$ (5,064,394)	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 13,064,394	\$ 0	\$ 681,874	\$ 681,874	\$ (4,382,520)	\$ 8,470,099	\$ 9,151,973	\$ 4,087,579	\$ 0.4238
Anaheim	\$ (15,108,049)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,108,049)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,108,049)	\$ 0
Azusa	\$ (784,515)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (784,515)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (784,515)	\$ 0
Banning	\$ (673,488)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (673,488)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (673,488)	\$ 0
Pasadena	\$ (4,508,666)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (4,508,666)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (4,508,666)	\$ 0
Riverside	\$ (15,713,495)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,713,495)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,713,495)	\$ 0
Vernon	\$ 1,089,014	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,089,014	\$ 0	\$ (1,089,014)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,089,014)	\$ 0	\$ (0.8660)
Startrans	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 72,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 37,150,811</b>	<b>\$ 1,939,024</b>	<b>\$ 1,939,024</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## August 01, 2009 TAC Rates

### Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 4: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for New Facilities and Total projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge.**

	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [41] =[2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [42] =[3]	New HVTRR Rate (\$/MWh) [43] =[15]/[16]	New HVTRR Cost Responsibility (\$) [44] =[42] * [43]	NHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [45] =[44] - [41]	Total Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [46] =[45] + [39]
PGE	\$ 166,550,793	94,466,738	\$ 2.1160	\$ 199,891,910	\$ 33,341,117	\$ 49,691,434
SCE	\$ 193,107,640	92,450,710	\$ 2.1160	\$ 195,625,989	\$ 2,518,349	\$ 18,868,666
SDGE	\$ 70,036,379	21,596,392	\$ 2.1160	\$ 45,698,032	\$ (24,338,347)	\$ (20,250,767)
Anaheim	\$ -	2,766,313	\$ 2.1160	\$ 5,853,527	\$ 5,853,527	\$ (9,254,522)
Azusa	\$ -	239,575	\$ 2.1160	\$ 506,941	\$ 506,941	\$ (277,573)
Banning	\$ -	139,457	\$ 2.1160	\$ 295,091	\$ 295,091	\$ (378,396)
Pasadena	\$ -	1,239,884	\$ 2.1160	\$ 2,623,598	\$ 2,623,598	\$ (1,885,068)
Riverside	\$ -	2,201,147	\$ 2.1160	\$ 4,657,634	\$ 4,657,634	\$ (11,055,861)
Vernon	\$ -	1,257,502	\$ 2.1160	\$ 2,660,878	\$ 2,660,878	\$ 2,660,878
Atlantic P15	\$ 28,118,790	0	\$ 2.1160	\$ 0	\$ (28,118,790)	\$ (28,118,790)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 457,813,602</b>	<b>216,357,718</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$ 457,813,602</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

ATTACHMENT D

## September 01, 2009 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

Based on the FERC Order on City of Riverside's Offer of Settlement (Docket No. EL09-52)

**TAC Components:**

	Filed Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [1]	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [2]	Filed Annual Gross Load (MWh) [3]	TAC Area [4]	Total Filed TRR (\$) = [1] + [2] [5]	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [6] = [1] / [3]	EHVF only TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [7] = [2] [1]	HV Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [8] = [5] / [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [9] = [19]
PGE	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 166,550,793	94,466,738	N	\$ 301,443,169	\$ 1.4279	\$ 1.7233	\$ 3.1910	\$ 3.8183
SCE	\$ 162,666,933	\$ 193,107,640	92,450,710	EC	\$ 355,774,573	\$ 1.7595	\$ 1.7927	\$ 3.8483	\$ 3.8924
SDGE	\$ 32,867,203	\$ 61,973,862	21,965,835	S	\$ 94,841,065	\$ 1.4963	\$ 1.7301	\$ 4.3177	\$ 3.8251
Anaheim	\$ 20,212,164	\$ -	2,766,313	EC	\$ 20,212,164	\$ 7.3065	\$ 1.7927	\$ 7.3065	\$ 3.8924
Azusa	\$ 1,226,554	\$ -	239,575	EC	\$ 1,226,554	\$ 5.1197	\$ 1.7927	\$ 5.1197	\$ 3.8924
Banning	\$ 930,800	\$ -	139,457	EC	\$ 930,800	\$ 6.6745	\$ 1.7927	\$ 6.6745	\$ 3.8924
Pasadena	\$ 6,796,373	\$ -	1,239,884	EC	\$ 6,796,373	\$ 5.4815	\$ 1.7927	\$ 5.4815	\$ 3.8924
Riverside	\$ 19,774,824	\$ -	2,201,147	EC	\$ 19,774,824	\$ 8.9839	\$ 1.7927	\$ 8.9839	\$ 3.8924
Vernon	\$ 1,231,199	\$ -	1,257,502	EC	\$ 1,231,199	\$ 0.9791	\$ 1.7927	\$ 0.9791	\$ 3.8924
Atlantic P15	\$ -	\$ 28,118,790	-	N	\$ 28,118,790	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3.8183
Startrans	\$ 4,760,375	\$ -	-	EC	\$ 4,760,375	\$ -	\$ 1.7927	\$ -	\$ 3.8924
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>\$ 385,358,800</b>	<b>\$ 449,751,085</b>	<b>216,727,161</b>		<b>\$ 835,109,885</b>				

**STEP 1: Calculate the Access Charge Rate for each TAC Area.**

TAC-Area portion is the percent of Total TRR in each area which has not yet transitioned to the ISO (10%) divided by the Total Load of each area.  
The ISO portion is the percent of all TRR which has transitioned to ISO-Wide (90%), plus the TRR of New HV Facilities, divided by total load.

	Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [10] = [1]	Annual TAC Area TRR (\$) [11] = [10] x 10%	Annual TAC Area TRR (w/Load) (\$) [11B] = ([10] w/Load) x 10%	Annual Gross Load (MWh) [12] = [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [13] = [11] / [12]	TAC Area Rate (TRR w/Load) (\$/MWh) [13B] = [11B] / [12]																							
North	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 13,489,238	\$ 13,489,238	94,466,738	\$ 0.1428	\$ 0.1428	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]</th> <th>Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]</th> <th>Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]</th> <th>New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>North</td> <td>\$ 3.8183</td> <td>\$ 3.8183</td> <td>\$ 1.7233</td> <td>\$ 2.0752</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East/Central</td> <td>\$ 3.8924</td> <td>\$ 3.8924</td> <td>\$ 1.7927</td> <td>\$ 2.0752</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South</td> <td>\$ 3.8251</td> <td>\$ 3.8251</td> <td>\$ 1.7301</td> <td>\$ 2.0752</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]	New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]	North	\$ 3.8183	\$ 3.8183	\$ 1.7233	\$ 2.0752	East/Central	\$ 3.8924	\$ 3.8924	\$ 1.7927	\$ 2.0752	South	\$ 3.8251	\$ 3.8251	\$ 1.7301	\$ 2.0752		
	TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]	New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]																									
North	\$ 3.8183	\$ 3.8183	\$ 1.7233	\$ 2.0752																									
East/Central	\$ 3.8924	\$ 3.8924	\$ 1.7927	\$ 2.0752																									
South	\$ 3.8251	\$ 3.8251	\$ 1.7301	\$ 2.0752																									
East/C	\$ 217,599,221	\$ 21,759,922	\$ 21,283,885	100,294,588	\$ 0.2170	\$ 0.2122																							
South	\$ 32,867,203	\$ 3,286,720	\$ 3,286,720	21,965,835	\$ 0.1496	\$ 0.1496																							
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 385,358,800</b>	<b>\$ 38,535,880</b>	<b>\$ 38,059,843</b>	<b>216,727,161</b>																									
	ISO Wide TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [14] Total ([10]) x 90%	ISO Wide TRR EHVf w/Load (\$) [14B] Total ([10] w/Load) x 90%	ISO Wide TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [15] = Total [2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [16] = Total [3]	ISO Wide Rate (\$/MWh) [17] = ([14] + [15]) / [16]	EHVF ISO-Wide Rate (TRR w/Load only) (\$/MWh) [18] = [14B] / [16]																							
<b>ISO-wide</b>	<b>\$ 346,822,920</b>	<b>\$ 342,538,583</b>	<b>\$ 449,751,085</b>	<b>216,727,161</b>	<b>\$ 3.6755</b>	<b>\$ 1.5805</b>																							

## September 01, 2009 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 2: Calculate the HV Access Charge the UDC/MSS pays on Filed Gross Load and Benefit/Burden.** Note: ISO total for (Benefit)/Burden may not equal zero due to rounding of TAC Rate.

TAC Area	Filed Gross Load (MWH)	EHVF only TAC Rate (\$/MWH)	Amount Paid Based on Filed Gross Load (\$)	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH)	Would Have Paid w/ EHVF Utility Specific Rate (\$)	EHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)
[23] =[4]	[24] =[3]	[25] =[7]	[26] =[24] x [25]	[27] =[6]	[28] =[24] x [27]	[29] =[26] - [28]
PGE N	94,466,738	\$ 1.7233	\$ 162,794,486	\$ 1.4279	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 27,902,110
SCE EC	92,450,710	\$ 1.7927	\$ 165,738,210	\$ 1.7595	\$ 162,666,933	\$ 3,071,277
SDGE S	21,965,835	\$ 1.7301	\$ 38,003,855	\$ 1.4963	\$ 32,867,203	\$ 5,136,652
Anaheim EC	2,766,313	\$ 1.7927	\$ 4,959,224	\$ 7.3065	\$ 20,212,164	\$ (15,252,940)
Azusa EC	239,575	\$ 1.7927	\$ 429,491	\$ 5.1197	\$ 1,226,554	\$ (797,063)
Banning EC	139,457	\$ 1.7927	\$ 250,007	\$ 6.6745	\$ 930,800	\$ (680,792)
Pasadena EC	1,239,884	\$ 1.7927	\$ 2,222,764	\$ 5.4815	\$ 6,796,373	\$ (4,573,608)
Riverside EC	2,201,147	\$ 1.7927	\$ 3,946,040	\$ 8.9839	\$ 19,774,824	\$ (15,828,784)
Vernon EC	1,257,502	\$ 1.7927	\$ 2,254,349	\$ 0.9791	\$ 1,231,199	\$ 1,023,150
Startrans EC	-	\$ 1.7927	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>216,727,161</b>		<b>\$ 380,598,425</b>		<b>\$ 380,598,425</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

**STEP 3: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for Existing Facilities.**

\$32/32/8 million cap for IOUs; munis are held harmless; IOUs pay muni cost increases in proportion to their cap relative to the total cap.

	EHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)	IOU Burden Annual Cap (\$)	Amount IOUs' Cap Exceeds IOUs' Burden (\$)	Amount IOU's Burden Exceeds IOU's Cap (\$)	Payments by Entities with Net Benefit (\$)	Mitigation Payments (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Reallocation IOU Burden (\$)	Transition Charge (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Transition Charge Rate (\$/MWh)
	[30] =[29]	[31]	[32] IF ([31] - [30] > 0) = [31] - [30]. If no cap, then 0.	[33] IF [30] - [31] > 0 = [30] - [31]. If no cap, then 0.	[34] IOUs = ((32) / total(32)) x total(33). Munis w/ Benefit = ([30] / total(30)) x total(33) - total(32)	[35] = [34] - [33]	[36] = [30] + [35]	[37] Reallocate IOU Burden [39] so it is proportional to IOU Cap [31] = [39] - [36]	[38] = [35] + [37]	[39] = [36] + [37]	[40] = [38] / [24]
PGE	\$ 27,902,110	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 4,097,890	\$ 0	\$ 116,822	\$ 116,822	\$ 28,018,932	\$ (11,515,293)	\$ (11,398,471)	\$ 16,503,639	\$ (0.1207)
SCE	\$ 3,071,277	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 28,928,723	\$ 0	\$ 824,699	\$ 824,699	\$ 3,895,976	\$ 12,607,663	\$ 13,432,362	\$ 16,503,639	\$ 0.1453
SDGE	\$ 5,136,652	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 2,863,348	\$ 0	\$ 81,628	\$ 81,628	\$ 5,218,280	\$ (1,092,370)	\$ (1,010,742)	\$ 4,125,910	\$ (0.0460)
Anaheim	\$ (15,252,940)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,252,940)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,252,940)	\$ 0
Azusa	\$ (797,063)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (797,063)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (797,063)	\$ 0
Banning	\$ (680,792)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (680,792)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (680,792)	\$ 0
Pasadena	\$ (4,573,608)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (4,573,608)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (4,573,608)	\$ 0
Riverside	\$ (15,828,784)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,828,784)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,828,784)	\$ 0
Vernon	\$ 1,023,150	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,023,150	\$ 0	\$ (1,023,150)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,023,150)	\$ 0	\$ (0.8136)
Startrans	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 72,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 35,889,961</b>	<b>\$ 1,023,150</b>	<b>\$ 1,023,150</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## September 01, 2009 TAC Rates

### Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 4: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for New Facilities and Total projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge.**

	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [41] =[2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [42] =[3]	New HVTRR Rate (\$/MWh) [43] =[15]/[16]	New HVTRR Cost Responsibility (\$) [44] =[42] * [43]	NHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [45] =[44] - [41]	Total Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [46] =[45] + [39]
PGE	\$ 166,550,793	94,466,738	\$ 2.0752	\$ 196,036,887	\$ 29,486,094	\$ 45,989,733
SCE	\$ 193,107,640	92,450,710	\$ 2.0752	\$ 191,853,236	\$ (1,254,404)	\$ 15,249,235
SDGE	\$ 61,973,862	21,965,835	\$ 2.0752	\$ 45,583,387	\$ (16,390,475)	\$ (12,264,565)
Anaheim	\$ -	2,766,313	\$ 2.0752	\$ 5,740,638	\$ 5,740,638	\$ (9,512,302)
Azusa	\$ -	239,575	\$ 2.0752	\$ 497,165	\$ 497,165	\$ (299,898)
Banning	\$ -	139,457	\$ 2.0752	\$ 289,400	\$ 289,400	\$ (391,392)
Pasadena	\$ -	1,239,884	\$ 2.0752	\$ 2,573,001	\$ 2,573,001	\$ (2,000,607)
Riverside	\$ -	2,201,147	\$ 2.0752	\$ 4,567,809	\$ 4,567,809	\$ (11,260,976)
Vernon	\$ -	1,257,502	\$ 2.0752	\$ 2,609,562	\$ 2,609,562	\$ 2,609,562
Atlantic P15	\$ 28,118,790	0	\$ 2.0752	\$ 0	\$ (28,118,790)	\$ (28,118,790)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 449,751,085</b>	<b>216,727,161</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$ 449,751,085</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

ATTACHMENT E

## October 01, 2009 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

Based on the FERC Order on City of Pasadena's Offer of Settlement (Docket No. EL09-67)

**TAC Components:**

	Filed Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [1]	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [2]	Filed Annual Gross Load (MWh) [3]	TAC Area [4]	Total Filed TRR (\$) = [1] + [2] [5]	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [6] = [1] / [3]	EHVF only TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [7] = [2] [1]	HV Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [8] = [5] / [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [9] = [19]
PGE	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 166,550,793	94,466,738	N	\$ 301,443,169	\$ 1.4279	\$ 1.7331	\$ 3.1910	\$ 3.8275
SCE	\$ 162,666,933	\$ 193,107,640	92,450,710	EC	\$ 355,774,573	\$ 1.7595	\$ 1.8048	\$ 3.8483	\$ 3.9040
SDGE	\$ 32,867,203	\$ 61,973,862	21,965,835	S	\$ 94,841,065	\$ 1.4963	\$ 1.7399	\$ 4.3177	\$ 3.8343
Anaheim	\$ 20,212,164	\$ -	2,766,313	EC	\$ 20,212,164	\$ 7.3065	\$ 1.8048	\$ 7.3065	\$ 3.9040
Azusa	\$ 1,226,554	\$ -	239,575	EC	\$ 1,226,554	\$ 5.1197	\$ 1.8048	\$ 5.1197	\$ 3.9040
Banning	\$ 930,800	\$ -	139,457	EC	\$ 930,800	\$ 6.6745	\$ 1.8048	\$ 6.6745	\$ 3.9040
Pasadena	\$ 9,245,886	\$ -	1,295,096	EC	\$ 9,245,886	\$ 7.1392	\$ 1.8048	\$ 7.1392	\$ 3.9040
Riverside	\$ 19,774,824	\$ -	2,201,147	EC	\$ 19,774,824	\$ 8.9839	\$ 1.8048	\$ 8.9839	\$ 3.9040
Vernon	\$ 1,231,199	\$ -	1,257,502	EC	\$ 1,231,199	\$ 0.9791	\$ 1.8048	\$ 0.9791	\$ 3.9040
Atlantic P15	\$ -	\$ 28,118,790	-	N	\$ 28,118,790	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3.8275
Startrans	\$ 4,760,375	\$ -	-	EC	\$ 4,760,375	\$ -	\$ 1.8048	\$ -	\$ 3.9040
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>\$ 387,808,313</b>	<b>\$ 449,751,085</b>	<b>216,782,373</b>		<b>\$ 837,559,398</b>				

**STEP 1: Calculate the Access Charge Rate for each TAC Area.**

TAC-Area portion is the percent of Total TRR in each area which has not yet transitioned to the ISO (10%) divided by the Total Load of each area.  
The ISO portion is the percent of all TRR which has transitioned to ISO-Wide (90%), plus the TRR of New HV Facilities, divided by total load.

	Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [10] = [1]	Annual TAC Area TRR (\$) [11] = [10] x 10%	Annual TAC Area TRR (w/Load) (\$) [11B] = ([10] w/Load) x 10%	Annual Gross Load (MWh) [12] = [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [13] = [11] / [12]	TAC Area Rate (TRR w/Load) (\$/MWh) [13B] = [11B] / [12]																							
North	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 13,489,238	\$ 13,489,238	94,466,738	\$ 0.1428	\$ 0.1428	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]</th> <th>Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]</th> <th>Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]</th> <th>New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>North</td> <td>\$ 3.8275</td> <td>\$ 3.8275</td> <td>\$ 1.7331</td> <td>\$ 2.0747</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East/Central</td> <td>\$ 3.9040</td> <td>\$ 3.9040</td> <td>\$ 1.8048</td> <td>\$ 2.0747</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South</td> <td>\$ 3.8343</td> <td>\$ 3.8343</td> <td>\$ 1.7399</td> <td>\$ 2.0747</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]	New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]	North	\$ 3.8275	\$ 3.8275	\$ 1.7331	\$ 2.0747	East/Central	\$ 3.9040	\$ 3.9040	\$ 1.8048	\$ 2.0747	South	\$ 3.8343	\$ 3.8343	\$ 1.7399	\$ 2.0747		
	TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]	New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]																									
North	\$ 3.8275	\$ 3.8275	\$ 1.7331	\$ 2.0747																									
East/Central	\$ 3.9040	\$ 3.9040	\$ 1.8048	\$ 2.0747																									
South	\$ 3.8343	\$ 3.8343	\$ 1.7399	\$ 2.0747																									
East/C	\$ 220,048,734	\$ 22,004,873	\$ 21,528,836	100,349,800	\$ 0.2193	\$ 0.2145																							
South	\$ 32,867,203	\$ 3,286,720	\$ 3,286,720	21,965,835	\$ 0.1496	\$ 0.1496																							
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 387,808,313</b>	<b>\$ 38,780,831</b>	<b>\$ 38,304,794</b>	<b>216,782,373</b>																									
	ISO Wide TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [14] Total ([10]) x 90%	ISO Wide TRR EHVf w/Load (\$) [14B] Total ([10] w/Load) x 90%	ISO Wide TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [15] = Total [2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [16] = Total [3]	ISO Wide Rate (\$/MWh) [17] = ([14] + [15]) / [16]	EHVF ISO-Wide Rate TRR w/Load only (\$/MWh) [18] = [14B] / [16]																							
<b>ISO-wide</b>	<b>\$ 349,027,482</b>	<b>\$ 344,743,145</b>	<b>\$ 449,751,085</b>	<b>216,782,373</b>	<b>\$ 3.6847</b>	<b>\$ 1.5903</b>																							

### October 01, 2009 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 2: Calculate the HV Access Charge the UDC/MSS pays on Filed Gross Load and Benefit/Burden.** Note: ISO total for (Benefit)/Burden may not equal zero due to rounding of TAC Rate.

TAC Area		Filed Gross Load (MWH)	EHV only TAC Rate (\$/MWH)	Amount Paid Based on Filed Gross Load (\$)	EHV only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH)	Would Have Paid w/ EHV Utility Specific Rate (\$)	EHV Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)
		[24] =[3]	[25] =[7]	[26] =[24] x [25]	[27] =[6]	[28] =[24] x [27]	[29] =[26] - [28]
PGE	N	94,466,738	\$ 1.7331	\$ 163,717,136	\$ 1.4279	\$ 134,892,376	\$ 28,824,760
SCE	EC	92,450,710	\$ 1.8048	\$ 166,856,045	\$ 1.7595	\$ 162,666,933	\$ 4,189,112
SDGE	S	21,965,835	\$ 1.7399	\$ 38,218,394	\$ 1.4963	\$ 32,867,203	\$ 5,351,191
Anaheim	EC	2,766,313	\$ 1.8048	\$ 4,992,672	\$ 7.3065	\$ 20,212,164	\$ (15,219,493)
Azusa	EC	239,575	\$ 1.8048	\$ 432,388	\$ 5.1197	\$ 1,226,554	\$ (794,166)
Banning	EC	139,457	\$ 1.8048	\$ 251,694	\$ 6.6745	\$ 930,800	\$ (679,106)
Pasadena	EC	1,295,096	\$ 1.8048	\$ 2,337,403	\$ 7.1392	\$ 9,245,886	\$ (6,908,482)
Riverside	EC	2,201,147	\$ 1.8048	\$ 3,972,654	\$ 8.9839	\$ 19,774,824	\$ (15,802,170)
Vernon	EC	1,257,502	\$ 1.8048	\$ 2,269,553	\$ 0.9791	\$ 1,231,199	\$ 1,038,354
Startrans	EC	-	\$ 1.8048	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>ISO Total</b>		<b>216,782,373</b>		<b>\$ 383,047,938</b>		<b>\$ 383,047,938</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

**STEP 3: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for Existing Facilities.**

\$32/32/8 million cap for IOUs; munis are held harmless; IOUs pay muni cost increases in proportion to their cap relative to the total cap.

	EHV Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [30] =[29]	IOU Burden Annual Cap (\$) [31]	Amount IOUs' Cap Exceeds IOUs' Burden (\$) [32] IF ([31] - [30] > 0) = [31] - [30]. If no cap, then 0.	Amount IOUs' Burden Exceeds IOUs' Cap (\$) [33] IF [30] - [31] > 0 = [30] - [31]. If no cap, then 0.	Payments by Entities with Net Benefit (\$) [34] IOUs = ((32) / total(32)) x total(33). Munis w/ Benefit= ([30] / total(30)) x total(33) - total(32)	Mitigation Payments (\$) [35] = [34] - [33]	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$) [36] = [30] + [35]	Reallocation IOU Burden (\$) [37] Reallocate IOU Burden [39] so it is proportional to IOU Cap [31] = [39] - [36]	Transition Charge (\$) [38] = [35] + [37]	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$) [39] = [36] + [37]	Transition Charge Rate (\$/MWh) [40] = [38] / [24]
PGE	\$ 28,824,760	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 3,175,240	\$ 0	\$ 98,024	\$ 98,024	\$ 28,922,784	\$ (11,410,154)	\$ (11,312,130)	\$ 17,512,630	\$ (0.1197)
SCE	\$ 4,189,112	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 27,810,888	\$ 0	\$ 858,558	\$ 858,558	\$ 5,047,671	\$ 12,464,959	\$ 13,323,518	\$ 17,512,630	\$ 0.1441
SDGE	\$ 5,351,191	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 2,648,809	\$ 0	\$ 81,772	\$ 81,772	\$ 5,432,963	\$ (1,054,805)	\$ (973,033)	\$ 4,378,157	\$ (0.0443)
Anaheim	\$ (15,219,493)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,219,493)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,219,493)	\$ 0
Azusa	\$ (794,166)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (794,166)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (794,166)	\$ 0
Banning	\$ (679,106)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (679,106)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (679,106)	\$ 0
Pasadena	\$ (6,908,482)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (6,908,482)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (6,908,482)	\$ 0
Riverside	\$ (15,802,170)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,802,170)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,802,170)	\$ 0
Vernon	\$ 1,038,354	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,038,354	\$ 0	\$ (1,038,354)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,038,354)	\$ 0	\$ (0.8257)
Startrans	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 72,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 33,634,937</b>	<b>\$ 1,038,354</b>	<b>\$ 1,038,354</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## October 01, 2009 TAC Rates

### Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 4: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for New Facilities and Total projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge.**

	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [41] =[2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [42] =[3]	New HVTRR Rate (\$/MWh) [43] =[15]/[16]	New HVTRR Cost Responsibility (\$) [44] =[42] * [43]	NHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [45] =[44] - [41]	Total Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [46] =[45] + [39]
PGE	\$ 166,550,793	94,466,738	\$ 2.0747	\$ 195,986,958	\$ 29,436,165	\$ 46,948,795
SCE	\$ 193,107,640	92,450,710	\$ 2.0747	\$ 191,804,373	\$ (1,303,267)	\$ 16,209,363
SDGE	\$ 61,973,862	21,965,835	\$ 2.0747	\$ 45,571,778	\$ (16,402,084)	\$ (12,023,927)
Anaheim	\$ -	2,766,313	\$ 2.0747	\$ 5,739,176	\$ 5,739,176	\$ (9,480,316)
Azusa	\$ -	239,575	\$ 2.0747	\$ 497,038	\$ 497,038	\$ (297,128)
Banning	\$ -	139,457	\$ 2.0747	\$ 289,327	\$ 289,327	\$ (389,779)
Pasadena	\$ -	1,295,096	\$ 2.0747	\$ 2,686,892	\$ 2,686,892	\$ (4,221,590)
Riverside	\$ -	2,201,147	\$ 2.0747	\$ 4,566,646	\$ 4,566,646	\$ (11,235,524)
Vernon	\$ -	1,257,502	\$ 2.0747	\$ 2,608,897	\$ 2,608,897	\$ 2,608,897
Atlantic P15	\$ 28,118,790	0	\$ 2.0747	\$ 0	\$ (28,118,790)	\$ (28,118,790)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 449,751,085</b>	<b>216,782,373</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$ 449,751,085</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

ATTACHMENT F

## January 01, 2010 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**TAC Components:**

	Filed Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [1]	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [2]	Filed Annual Gross Load (MWh) [3]	TAC Area [4]	Total Filed TRR (\$) = [1] + [2] [5]	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [6] = [1] / [3]	EHVF only TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [7] = [2] [1]	HV Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [8] = [5] / [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [9] = [19]
PGE	\$ 149,885,323	\$ 189,822,512	94,466,738	N	\$ 339,707,835	\$ 1.5866	\$ 2.1522	\$ 3.5961	\$ 4.3587
SCE	\$ 204,548,644	\$ 193,995,691	92,450,710	EC	\$ 398,544,335	\$ 2.2125	\$ 2.1522	\$ 4.3109	\$ 4.3587
SDGE	\$ 50,179,426	\$ 58,598,134	21,965,835	S	\$ 108,777,560	\$ 2.2844	\$ 2.1522	\$ 4.9521	\$ 4.3587
Anaheim	\$ 23,669,575	\$ -	2,766,313	EC	\$ 23,669,575	\$ 8.5564	\$ 2.1522	\$ 8.5564	\$ 4.3587
Azusa	\$ 1,623,004	\$ -	239,575	EC	\$ 1,623,004	\$ 6.7745	\$ 2.1522	\$ 6.7745	\$ 4.3587
Banning	\$ 1,151,110	\$ -	139,457	EC	\$ 1,151,110	\$ 8.2542	\$ 2.1522	\$ 8.2542	\$ 4.3587
Pasadena	\$ 12,978,057	\$ -	1,295,096	EC	\$ 12,978,057	\$ 10.0209	\$ 2.1522	\$ 10.0209	\$ 4.3587
Riverside	\$ 20,950,688	\$ -	2,201,147	EC	\$ 20,950,688	\$ 9.5181	\$ 2.1522	\$ 9.5181	\$ 4.3587
Vernon	\$ 1,630,724	\$ -	1,288,684	EC	\$ 1,630,724	\$ 1.2654	\$ 2.1522	\$ 1.2654	\$ 4.3587
Atlantic P15	\$ -	\$ 30,565,537	-	N	\$ 30,565,537	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4.3587
Startrans	\$ 5,421,188	\$ -	-	EC	\$ 5,421,188	\$ -	\$ 2.1522	\$ -	\$ 4.3587
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>\$ 472,037,739</b>	<b>\$ 472,981,874</b>	<b>216,813,555</b>		<b>\$ 945,019,613</b>				

**STEP 1: Calculate the Access Charge Rate for each TAC Area.**

TAC-Area portion is the percent of Total TRR in each area which has not yet transitioned to the ISO (0%) divided by the Total Load of each area.  
The ISO portion is the percent of all TRR which has transitioned to ISO-Wide (100%), plus the TRR of New HV Facilities, divided by total load.

Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [10] = [1]	Annual TAC Area TRR (\$) [11] = [10] x 0%	Annual TAC Area TRR (w/Load) (\$) [11B] = ([10] w/Load) x 0%	Annual Gross Load (MWh) [12] = [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [13] = [11] / [12]	TAC Area Rate (TRR w/Load) (\$/MWh) [13B] = [11B] / [12]	ISO Wide TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [14] Total ([10]) x 100%	ISO Wide TRR EHVf w/Load (\$) [14B] Total ([10] w/Load) x 100%	ISO Wide TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [15] = Total [2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [16] = Total [3]	ISO Wide Rate (\$/MWh) [17] = ([14] + [15]) / [16]	EHVF ISO-Wide Rate TRR w/Load only (\$/MWh) [18] = [14B] / [16]	TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilties (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = ([13B] + [18])	New HV Facilties (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]
North	\$ 149,885,323	\$ -	94,466,738	\$ -	\$ -							\$ 4.3587	\$ 4.3587	\$ 2.1522	\$ 2.1815
East/C	\$ 271,972,990	\$ -	100,380,982	\$ -	\$ -							\$ 4.3587	\$ 4.3587	\$ 2.1522	\$ 2.1815
South	\$ 50,179,426	\$ -	21,965,835	\$ -	\$ -							\$ 4.3587	\$ 4.3587	\$ 2.1522	\$ 2.1815
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 472,037,739</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>216,813,555</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>										
<b>ISO-wide</b>	<b>\$ 472,037,739</b>	<b>\$ 466,616,551</b>	<b>\$ 472,981,874</b>	<b>216,813,555</b>	<b>\$ 4.3587</b>	<b>\$ 2.1522</b>									

## January 01, 2010 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 2: Calculate the HV Access Charge the UDC/MSS pays on Filed Gross Load and Benefit/Burden.** Note: ISO total for (Benefit)/Burden may not equal zero due to rounding of TAC Rate.

TAC Area	Filed Gross Load (MWH)	EHVF only TAC Rate (\$/MWH)	Amount Paid Based on Filed Gross Load (\$)	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH)	Would Have Paid w/ EHVF Utility Specific Rate (\$)	EHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)
[23] =[4]	[24] =[3]	[25] =[7]	[26] =[24] x [25]	[27] =[6]	[28] =[24] x [27]	[29] =[26] - [28]
PGE N	94,466,738	\$ 2.1522	\$ 203,307,138	\$ 1.5866	\$ 149,885,323	\$ 53,421,815
SCE EC	92,450,710	\$ 2.1522	\$ 198,968,332	\$ 2.2125	\$ 204,548,644	\$ (5,580,312)
SDGE S	21,965,835	\$ 2.1522	\$ 47,273,899	\$ 2.2844	\$ 50,179,426	\$ (2,905,527)
Anaheim EC	2,766,313	\$ 2.1522	\$ 5,953,537	\$ 8.5564	\$ 23,669,575	\$ (17,716,038)
Azusa EC	239,575	\$ 2.1522	\$ 515,603	\$ 6.7745	\$ 1,623,004	\$ (1,107,401)
Banning EC	139,457	\$ 2.1522	\$ 300,133	\$ 8.2542	\$ 1,151,110	\$ (850,976)
Pasadena EC	1,295,096	\$ 2.1522	\$ 2,787,248	\$ 10.0209	\$ 12,978,057	\$ (10,190,809)
Riverside EC	2,201,147	\$ 2.1522	\$ 4,737,211	\$ 9.5181	\$ 20,950,688	\$ (16,213,477)
Vernon EC	1,288,684	\$ 2.1522	\$ 2,773,449	\$ 1.2654	\$ 1,630,724	\$ 1,142,725
Startrans EC	-	\$ 2.1522	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>216,813,555</b>		<b>\$ 466,616,551</b>		<b>\$ 466,616,551</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>

**STEP 3: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for Existing Facilities.**

\$32/32/8 million cap for IOUs; munis are held harmless; IOUs pay muni cost increases in proportion to their cap relative to the total cap.

	EHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)	IOU Burden Annual Cap (\$)	Amount IOUs' Cap Exceeds IOUs' Burden (\$)	Amount IOU's Burden Exceeds IOU's Cap (\$)	Payments by Entities with Net Benefit (\$)	Mitigation Payments (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Reallocation IOU Burden (\$)	Transition Charge (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Transition Charge Rate (\$/MWh)
	[30] =[29]	[31]	[32] IF ([31] - [30] > 0) = [31] - [30]. If no cap, then 0.	[33] IF [30] - [31] > 0 = [30] - [31]. If no cap, then 0.	[34] IOUs = ([32] / total[32]) x total[33]. Munis w/ Benefit = ([30] / total[30]) x total[33] - total[32]	[35] = [34] - [33]	[36] = [30] + [35]	[37] Reallocate IOU Burden [39] so it is proportional to IOU Cap [31] = [39] - [36]	[38] = [35] + [37]	[39] = [36] + [37]	[40] = [38] / [24]
PGE	\$ 53,421,815	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 21,421,815.4372	\$ 0	\$ (21,421,815)	\$ 32,000,000	\$ (11,520,577)	\$ (32,942,393)	\$ 20,479,423	\$ (0.3487)
SCE	\$ (5,580,312)	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 37,580,312	\$ 0	\$ 17,489,281	\$ 17,489,281	\$ 11,908,969	\$ 8,570,454	\$ 26,059,735	\$ 20,479,423	\$ 0.2819
SDGE	\$ (2,905,527)	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 10,905,527	\$ 0	\$ 5,075,259	\$ 5,075,259	\$ 2,169,732	\$ 2,950,123	\$ 8,025,382	\$ 5,119,856	\$ 0.3654
Anaheim	\$ (17,716,038)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (17,716,038)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (17,716,038)	\$ 0
Azusa	\$ (1,107,401)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,107,401)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,107,401)	\$ 0
Banning	\$ (850,976)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (850,976)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (850,976)	\$ 0
Pasadena	\$ (10,190,809)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (10,190,809)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (10,190,809)	\$ 0
Riverside	\$ (16,213,477)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (16,213,477)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (16,213,477)	\$ 0
Vernon	\$ 1,142,725	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,142,725	\$ 0	\$ (1,142,725)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,142,725)	\$ 0	\$ (0.8867)
Startrans	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 72,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 48,485,839</b>	<b>\$ 22,564,540</b>	<b>\$ 22,564,540</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## January 01, 2010 TAC Rates

### Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 4: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for New Facilities and Total projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge.**

	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [41] =[2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [42] =[3]	New HVTRR Rate (\$/MWh) [43] =[15]/[16]	New HVTRR Cost Responsibility (\$) [44] =[42] * [43]	NHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [45] =[44] - [41]	Total Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [46] =[45] + [39]
PGE	\$ 189,822,512	94,466,738	\$ 2.1815	\$ 206,080,541	\$ 16,258,029	\$ 36,737,452
SCE	\$ 193,995,691	92,450,710	\$ 2.1815	\$ 201,682,547	\$ 7,686,856	\$ 28,166,279
SDGE	\$ 58,598,134	21,965,835	\$ 2.1815	\$ 47,918,784	\$ (10,679,350)	\$ (5,559,495)
Anaheim	\$ -	2,766,313	\$ 2.1815	\$ 6,034,751	\$ 6,034,751	\$ (11,681,287)
Azusa	\$ -	239,575	\$ 2.1815	\$ 522,636	\$ 522,636	\$ (584,765)
Banning	\$ -	139,457	\$ 2.1815	\$ 304,227	\$ 304,227	\$ (546,749)
Pasadena	\$ -	1,295,096	\$ 2.1815	\$ 2,825,270	\$ 2,825,270	\$ (7,365,538)
Riverside	\$ -	2,201,147	\$ 2.1815	\$ 4,801,834	\$ 4,801,834	\$ (11,411,643)
Vernon	\$ -	1,288,684	\$ 2.1815	\$ 2,811,283	\$ 2,811,283	\$ 2,811,283
Atlantic P15	\$ 30,565,537	0	\$ 2.1815	\$ 0	\$ (30,565,537)	\$ (30,565,537)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 472,981,874</b>	<b>216,813,555</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$ 472,981,874</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## ATTACHMENT G

### March 01, 2010 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

Based on FERC Order on PG&E's Motion for Interim Rates (ER09-1521)

**TAC Components:**

	Filed Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [1]	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [2]	Filed Annual Gross Load (MWh) [3]	TAC Area [4]	Total Filed TRR (\$) = [1] + [2] [5]	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH) [6] = [1] / [3]	EHVF only TAC Area Rate (\$/MWH) [7] = [2] [1]	HV Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH) [8] = [5] / [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWH) [9] = [19]
PGE	\$ 160,324,704	\$ 209,625,978	90,326,715	N	\$ 369,950,682	\$ 1.7749	\$ 2.4513	\$ 4.0957	\$ 5.0939
SCE	\$ 241,066,782	\$ 249,428,193	89,286,280	EC	\$ 490,494,975	\$ 2.6999	\$ 2.4513	\$ 5.4935	\$ 5.0939
SDGE	\$ 50,179,426	\$ 58,598,134	21,965,835	S	\$ 108,777,560	\$ 2.2844	\$ 2.4513	\$ 4.9521	\$ 5.0939
Anaheim	\$ 23,669,575	\$ -	2,766,313	EC	\$ 23,669,575	\$ 8.5564	\$ 2.4513	\$ 8.5564	\$ 5.0939
Azusa	\$ 1,623,004	\$ -	239,575	EC	\$ 1,623,004	\$ 6.7745	\$ 2.4513	\$ 6.7745	\$ 5.0939
Banning	\$ 1,151,110	\$ -	139,457	EC	\$ 1,151,110	\$ 8.2542	\$ 2.4513	\$ 8.2542	\$ 5.0939
Pasadena	\$ 12,978,057	\$ -	1,295,096	EC	\$ 12,978,057	\$ 10.0209	\$ 2.4513	\$ 10.0209	\$ 5.0939
Riverside	\$ 20,950,688	\$ -	2,201,147	EC	\$ 20,950,688	\$ 9.5181	\$ 2.4513	\$ 9.5181	\$ 5.0939
Vernon	\$ 1,630,724	\$ -	1,288,684	EC	\$ 1,630,724	\$ 1.2654	\$ 2.4513	\$ 1.2654	\$ 5.0939
Atlantic P15	\$ -	\$ 30,565,537	-	N	\$ 30,565,537	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5.0939
Startrans	\$ 5,421,188	\$ -	-	EC	\$ 5,421,188	\$ -	\$ 2.4513	\$ -	\$ 5.0939
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>\$ 518,995,258</b>	<b>\$ 548,217,842</b>	<b>209,509,102</b>		<b>\$ 1,067,213,100</b>				

**STEP 1: Calculate the Access Charge Rate for each TAC Area.**

TAC-Area portion is the percent of Total TRR in each area which has not yet transitioned to the ISO (0%) divided by the Total Load of each area.  
The ISO portion is the percent of all TRR which has transitioned to ISO-Wide (100%), plus the TRR of New HV Facilities, divided by total load.

	Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [10] = [1]	Annual TAC Area TRR (\$) [11] = [10] x 0%	Annual TAC Area TRR (w/Load) (\$) [11B] = ([10] w/Load) x 0%	Annual Gross Load (MWh) [12] = [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWH) [13] = [11] / [12]	TAC Area Rate (TRR w/Load) (\$/MWH) [13B] = [11B] / [12]																							
North	\$ 160,324,704	\$ -	\$ -	90,326,715	\$ -	\$ -	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWH) [19] = [13] + [17]</th> <th>Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWH) [20] = [19]</th> <th>Existing HV Faciltes (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWH) [21] = [[13B]] + [18]</th> <th>New HV Faciltes (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWH) [22] = [15] / [16]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>North</td> <td>\$ 5.0939</td> <td>\$ 5.0939</td> <td>\$ 2.4513</td> <td>\$ 2.6167</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East/Central</td> <td>\$ 5.0939</td> <td>\$ 5.0939</td> <td>\$ 2.4513</td> <td>\$ 2.6167</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South</td> <td>\$ 5.0939</td> <td>\$ 5.0939</td> <td>\$ 2.4513</td> <td>\$ 2.6167</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWH) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWH) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Faciltes (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWH) [21] = [[13B]] + [18]	New HV Faciltes (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWH) [22] = [15] / [16]	North	\$ 5.0939	\$ 5.0939	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6167	East/Central	\$ 5.0939	\$ 5.0939	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6167	South	\$ 5.0939	\$ 5.0939	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6167		
	TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWH) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWH) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Faciltes (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWH) [21] = [[13B]] + [18]	New HV Faciltes (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWH) [22] = [15] / [16]																									
North	\$ 5.0939	\$ 5.0939	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6167																									
East/Central	\$ 5.0939	\$ 5.0939	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6167																									
South	\$ 5.0939	\$ 5.0939	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6167																									
East/C	\$ 308,491,128	\$ -	\$ -	97,216,552	\$ -	\$ -																							
South	\$ 50,179,426	\$ -	\$ -	21,965,835	\$ -	\$ -																							
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 518,995,258</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>209,509,102</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>																							
	ISO Wide TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [14] Total ([10]) x 100%	ISO Wide TRR EHVf w/Load (\$) [14B] Total ([10] w/Load) x 100%	ISO Wide TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [15] = Total [2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [16] = Total [3]	ISO Wide Rate (\$/MWH) [17] = ([14] + [15]) / [16]	EHVF ISO-Wide Rate TRR w/Load only (\$/MWH) [18] = [14B] / [16]																							
<b>ISO-wide</b>	<b>\$ 518,995,258</b>	<b>\$ 513,574,070</b>	<b>\$ 548,217,842</b>	<b>209,509,102</b>	<b>\$ 5.0939</b>	<b>\$ 2.4513</b>																							

### March 01, 2010 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 2: Calculate the HV Access Charge the UDC/MSS pays on Filed Gross Load and Benefit/Burden.** Note: ISO total for (Benefit)/Burden may not equal zero due to rounding of TAC Rate.

TAC Area		Filed Gross Load (MWH)	EHV only TAC Rate (\$/MWH)	Amount Paid Based on Filed Gross Load (\$)	EHV only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH)	Would Have Paid w/ EHV Utility Specific Rate (\$)	EHV Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)
[23]	[24]	[25]	[26]	[27]	[28]	[29]	[29]
= [4]	= [3]	= [7]	= [24] x [25]	= [6]	= [24] x [27]	= [26] - [28]	
PGE	N	90,326,715	\$ 2.4513	\$ 221,419,777	\$ 1.7749	\$ 160,324,704	\$ 61,095,073
SCE	EC	89,286,280	\$ 2.4513	\$ 218,869,337	\$ 2.6999	\$ 241,066,782	\$ (22,197,445)
SDGE	S	21,965,835	\$ 2.4513	\$ 53,845,313	\$ 2.2844	\$ 50,179,426	\$ 3,665,887
Anaheim	EC	2,766,313	\$ 2.4513	\$ 6,781,121	\$ 8.5564	\$ 23,669,575	\$ (16,888,454)
Azusa	EC	239,575	\$ 2.4513	\$ 587,275	\$ 6.7745	\$ 1,623,004	\$ (1,035,729)
Banning	EC	139,457	\$ 2.4513	\$ 341,854	\$ 8.2542	\$ 1,151,110	\$ (809,256)
Pasadena	EC	1,295,096	\$ 2.4513	\$ 3,174,696	\$ 10.0209	\$ 12,978,057	\$ (9,803,361)
Riverside	EC	2,201,147	\$ 2.4513	\$ 5,395,718	\$ 9.5181	\$ 20,950,688	\$ (15,554,970)
Vernon	EC	1,288,684	\$ 2.4513	\$ 3,158,978	\$ 1.2654	\$ 1,630,724	\$ 1,528,254
Startrans	EC	-	\$ 2.4513	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>ISO Total</b>		<b>209,509,102</b>		<b>\$ 513,574,070</b>		<b>\$ 513,574,070</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>

**STEP 3: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for Existing Facilities.**

\$32/32/8 million cap for IOUs; munis are held harmless; IOUs pay muni cost increases in proportion to their cap relative to the total cap.

	EHV Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)	IOU Burden Annual Cap (\$)	Amount IOUs' Cap Exceeds IOUs' Burden (\$)	Amount IOU's Burden Exceeds IOU's Cap (\$)	Payments by Entities with Net Benefit (\$)	Mitigation Payments (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Reallocation IOU Burden (\$)	Transition Charge (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Transition Charge Rate (\$/MWh)
	[30]	[31]	[32]	[33]	[34]	[35]	[36]	[37]	[38]	[39]	[40]
	= [29]		IF ([31] - [30] > 0) = [31] - [30]. If no cap, then 0.	IF [30] - [31] > 0 = [30] - [31]. If no cap, then 0.	IOUs = (([32] / total[32]) x total[33]). Munis w/ Benefit = ([30] / total[30]) x total[33] - total[32]	= [34] - [33]	= [30] + [35]	Reallocate IOU Burden [39] so it is proportional to IOU Cap [31] = [39] - [36]	= [35] + [37]	= [36] + [37]	= [38] / [24]
PGE	\$ 61,095,073	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 29,095,072.9087	\$ 0	\$ (29,095,073)	\$ 32,000,000	\$ (12,403,658)	\$ (41,498,731)	\$ 19,596,342	\$ (0.4594)
SCE	\$ (22,197,445)	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 54,197,445	\$ 0	\$ 28,355,748	\$ 28,355,748	\$ 6,158,303	\$ 13,438,039	\$ 41,793,787	\$ 19,596,342	\$ 0.4681
SDGE	\$ 3,665,887	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 4,334,113	\$ 0	\$ 2,267,579	\$ 2,267,579	\$ 5,933,467	\$ (1,034,381)	\$ 1,233,198	\$ 4,899,085	\$ 0.0561
Anaheim	\$ (16,888,454)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (16,888,454)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (16,888,454)	\$ 0
Azusa	\$ (1,035,729)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,035,729)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,035,729)	\$ 0
Banning	\$ (809,256)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (809,256)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (809,256)	\$ 0
Pasadena	\$ (9,803,361)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (9,803,361)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (9,803,361)	\$ 0
Riverside	\$ (15,554,970)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,554,970)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,554,970)	\$ 0
Vernon	\$ 1,528,254	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,528,254	\$ 0	\$ (1,528,254)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,528,254)	\$ 0	\$ (1.1859)
Startrans	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 72,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 58,531,558</b>	<b>\$ 30,623,327</b>	<b>\$ 30,623,327</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

### March 01, 2010 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 4: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for New Facilities and Total projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge.**

	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [41] =[2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [42] =[3]	New HVTRR Rate (\$/MWh) [43] =[15]/[16]	New HVTRR Cost Responsibility (\$) [44] =[42] * [43]	NHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [45] =[44] - [41]	Total Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [46] =[45] + [39]
PGE	\$ 209,625,978	90,326,715	\$ 2.6167	\$ 236,355,921	\$ 26,729,943	\$ 46,326,285
SCE	\$ 249,428,193	89,286,280	\$ 2.6167	\$ 233,633,438	\$ (15,794,755)	\$ 3,801,587
SDGE	\$ 58,598,134	21,965,835	\$ 2.6167	\$ 57,477,516	\$ (1,120,618)	\$ 3,778,467
Anaheim	\$ -	2,766,313	\$ 2.6167	\$ 7,238,550	\$ 7,238,550	\$ (9,649,904)
Azusa	\$ -	239,575	\$ 2.6167	\$ 626,891	\$ 626,891	\$ (408,838)
Banning	\$ -	139,457	\$ 2.6167	\$ 364,914	\$ 364,914	\$ (444,342)
Pasadena	\$ -	1,295,096	\$ 2.6167	\$ 3,388,849	\$ 3,388,849	\$ (6,414,512)
Riverside	\$ -	2,201,147	\$ 2.6167	\$ 5,759,693	\$ 5,759,693	\$ (9,795,277)
Vernon	\$ -	1,288,684	\$ 2.6167	\$ 3,372,071	\$ 3,372,071	\$ 3,372,071
Atlantic P15	\$ 30,565,537	0	\$ 2.6167	\$ 0	\$ (30,565,537)	\$ (30,565,537)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 548,217,842</b>	<b>209,509,102</b>		<b>\$ 548,217,842</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## ATTACHMENT H

## June 01, 2010 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

Based on FERC Order on SCE's Revised Transmission Revenue Requirement (ER10-160)

**TAC Components:**

	Filed Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [1]	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [2]	Filed Annual Gross Load (MWh) [3]	TAC Area [4]	Total Filed TRR (\$) = [1] + [2] [5]	EHVF only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [6] = [5] / [3]	EHVF only TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [7] = [21]	HV Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWh) [8] = [5] / [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [9] = [19]
PGE	\$ 160,324,704	\$ 209,625,978	90,326,715	N	\$ 369,950,682	\$ 1.7749	\$ 2.4513	\$ 4.0957	\$ 5.1299
SCE	\$ 241,066,782	\$ 256,982,193	89,286,280	EC	\$ 498,048,975	\$ 2.6999	\$ 2.4513	\$ 5.5781	\$ 5.1299
SDGE	\$ 50,179,426	\$ 58,598,134	21,965,835	S	\$ 108,777,560	\$ 2.2844	\$ 2.4513	\$ 4.9521	\$ 5.1299
Anaheim	\$ 23,669,575	\$ -	2,766,313	EC	\$ 23,669,575	\$ 8.5564	\$ 2.4513	\$ 8.5564	\$ 5.1299
Azusa	\$ 1,623,004	\$ -	239,575	EC	\$ 1,623,004	\$ 6.7745	\$ 2.4513	\$ 6.7745	\$ 5.1299
Banning	\$ 1,151,110	\$ -	139,457	EC	\$ 1,151,110	\$ 8.2542	\$ 2.4513	\$ 8.2542	\$ 5.1299
Pasadena	\$ 12,978,057	\$ -	1,295,096	EC	\$ 12,978,057	\$ 10.0209	\$ 2.4513	\$ 10.0209	\$ 5.1299
Riverside	\$ 20,950,688	\$ -	2,201,147	EC	\$ 20,950,688	\$ 9.5181	\$ 2.4513	\$ 9.5181	\$ 5.1299
Vernon	\$ 1,630,724	\$ -	1,288,684	EC	\$ 1,630,724	\$ 1.2654	\$ 2.4513	\$ 1.2654	\$ 5.1299
Atlantic P15	\$ -	\$ 30,565,537	-	N	\$ 30,565,537	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5.1299
Startrans	\$ 5,421,188	\$ -	-	EC	\$ 5,421,188	\$ -	\$ 2.4513	\$ -	\$ 5.1299
<b>ISO Total</b>	<b>\$ 518,995,258</b>	<b>\$ 555,771,842</b>	<b>209,509,102</b>		<b>\$ 1,074,767,100</b>				

**STEP 1: Calculate the Access Charge Rate for each TAC Area.**

TAC-Area portion is the percent of Total TRR in each area which has not yet transitioned to the ISO (0%) divided by the Total Load of each area.  
The ISO portion is the percent of all TRR which has transitioned to ISO-Wide (100%), plus the TRR of New HV Facilities, divided by total load.

	Annual TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [10] = [1]	Annual TAC Area TRR (\$) [11] = [10] x 0%	Annual TAC Area TRR (w/Load) (\$) [11B] = ([10] w/Load) x 0%	Annual Gross Load (MWh) [12] = [3]	TAC Area Rate (\$/MWh) [13] = [11] / [12]	TAC Area Rate (TRR w/Load) (\$/MWh) [13B] = [11B] / [12]																							
North	\$ 160,324,704	\$ -	\$ -	90,326,715	\$ -	\$ -	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]</th> <th>Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]</th> <th>Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]</th> <th>New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>North</td> <td>\$ 5.1299</td> <td>\$ 5.1299</td> <td>\$ 2.4513</td> <td>\$ 2.6527</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East/Central</td> <td>\$ 5.1299</td> <td>\$ 5.1299</td> <td>\$ 2.4513</td> <td>\$ 2.6527</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South</td> <td>\$ 5.1299</td> <td>\$ 5.1299</td> <td>\$ 2.4513</td> <td>\$ 2.6527</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]	New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]	North	\$ 5.1299	\$ 5.1299	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6527	East/Central	\$ 5.1299	\$ 5.1299	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6527	South	\$ 5.1299	\$ 5.1299	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6527		
	TAC Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [19] = [13] + [17]	Wheeling Rate (TAC Area + ISO Wide) (\$/MWh) [20] = [19]	Existing HV Facilities (EHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [21] = [13B] + [18]	New HV Facilities (NHVF) only TAC Rate (\$/MWh) [22] = [15] / [16]																									
North	\$ 5.1299	\$ 5.1299	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6527																									
East/Central	\$ 5.1299	\$ 5.1299	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6527																									
South	\$ 5.1299	\$ 5.1299	\$ 2.4513	\$ 2.6527																									
East/C	\$ 308,491,128	\$ -	\$ -	97,216,552	\$ -	\$ -																							
South	\$ 50,179,426	\$ -	\$ -	21,965,835	\$ -	\$ -																							
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 518,995,258</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>209,509,102</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>																							
	ISO Wide TRR Existing HV Facilities (\$) [14] Total ([10]) x 100%	ISO Wide TRR EHVf w/Load (\$) [14B] Total ([10] w/Load) x 100%	ISO Wide TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [15] = Total [2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [16] = Total [3]	ISO Wide Rate (\$/MWh) [17] = ([14] + [15]) / [16]	EHVF ISO-Wide Rate TRR w/Load only (\$/MWh) [18] = [14B] / [16]																							
<b>ISO-wide</b>	<b>\$ 518,995,258</b>	<b>\$ 513,574,070</b>	<b>\$ 555,771,842</b>	<b>209,509,102</b>	<b>\$ 5.1299</b>	<b>\$ 2.4513</b>																							

## June 01, 2010 TAC Rates Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 2: Calculate the HV Access Charge the UDC/MSS pays on Filed Gross Load and Benefit/Burden.** Note: ISO total for (Benefit)/Burden may not equal zero due to rounding of TAC Rate.

TAC Area		Filed Gross Load (MWH)	EHV only TAC Rate (\$/MWH)	Amount Paid Based on Filed Gross Load (\$)	EHV only Utility Specific Rate (\$/MWH)	Would Have Paid w/ EHV Utility Specific Rate (\$)	EHV Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)
[23]	[24]	[25]	[26]	[27]	[28]	[29]	[29]
= [4]	= [3]	= [7]	= [24] x [25]	= [6]	= [24] x [27]	= [26] - [28]	
PGE	N	90,326,715	\$ 2.4513	\$ 221,419,777	\$ 1.7749	\$ 160,324,704	\$ 61,095,073
SCE	EC	89,286,280	\$ 2.4513	\$ 218,869,337	\$ 2.6999	\$ 241,066,782	\$ (22,197,445)
SDGE	S	21,965,835	\$ 2.4513	\$ 53,845,313	\$ 2.2844	\$ 50,179,426	\$ 3,665,887
Anaheim	EC	2,766,313	\$ 2.4513	\$ 6,781,121	\$ 8.5564	\$ 23,669,575	\$ (16,888,454)
Azusa	EC	239,575	\$ 2.4513	\$ 587,275	\$ 6.7745	\$ 1,623,004	\$ (1,035,729)
Banning	EC	139,457	\$ 2.4513	\$ 341,854	\$ 8.2542	\$ 1,151,110	\$ (809,256)
Pasadena	EC	1,295,096	\$ 2.4513	\$ 3,174,696	\$ 10.0209	\$ 12,978,057	\$ (9,803,361)
Riverside	EC	2,201,147	\$ 2.4513	\$ 5,395,718	\$ 9.5181	\$ 20,950,688	\$ (15,554,970)
Vernon	EC	1,288,684	\$ 2.4513	\$ 3,158,978	\$ 1.2654	\$ 1,630,724	\$ 1,528,254
Startrans	EC	-	\$ 2.4513	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>ISO Total</b>		<b>209,509,102</b>		<b>\$ 513,574,070</b>		<b>\$ 513,574,070</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>

**STEP 3: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for Existing Facilities.**

\$32/32/8 million cap for IOUs; munis are held harmless; IOUs pay muni cost increases in proportion to their cap relative to the total cap.

	EHV Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$)	IOU Burden Annual Cap (\$)	Amount IOUs' Cap Exceeds IOUs' Burden (\$)	Amount IOU's Burden Exceeds IOU's Cap (\$)	Payments by Entities with Net Benefit (\$)	Mitigation Payments (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Reallocation IOU Burden (\$)	Transition Charge (\$)	Adjusted Net (Benefit) / Burden (\$)	Transition Charge Rate (\$/MWh)
	[30]	[31]	[32]	[33]	[34]	[35]	[36]	[37]	[38]	[39]	[40]
	= [29]		IF ([31] - [30] > 0) = [31] - [30]. If no cap, then 0.	IF [30] - [31] > 0 = [30] - [31]. If no cap, then 0.	IOUs = (([32] / total[32]) x total[33]). Munis w/ Benefit = ([30] / total[30]) x total[33] - total[32]	= [34] - [33]	= [30] + [35]	Reallocate IOU Burden [39] so it is proportional to IOU Cap [31] = [39] - [36]	= [35] + [37]	= [36] + [37]	= [38] / [24]
PGE	\$ 61,095,073	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 29,095,072.9087	\$ 0	\$ (29,095,073)	\$ 32,000,000	\$ (12,403,658)	\$ (41,498,731)	\$ 19,596,342	\$ (0.4594)
SCE	\$ (22,197,445)	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 54,197,445	\$ 0	\$ 28,355,748	\$ 28,355,748	\$ 6,158,303	\$ 13,438,039	\$ 41,793,787	\$ 19,596,342	\$ 0.4681
SDGE	\$ 3,665,887	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 4,334,113	\$ 0	\$ 2,267,579	\$ 2,267,579	\$ 5,933,467	\$ (1,034,381)	\$ 1,233,198	\$ 4,899,085	\$ 0.0561
Anaheim	\$ (16,888,454)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (16,888,454)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (16,888,454)	\$ 0
Azusa	\$ (1,035,729)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,035,729)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,035,729)	\$ 0
Banning	\$ (809,256)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (809,256)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (809,256)	\$ 0
Pasadena	\$ (9,803,361)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (9,803,361)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (9,803,361)	\$ 0
Riverside	\$ (15,554,970)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,554,970)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (15,554,970)	\$ 0
Vernon	\$ 1,528,254	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,528,254	\$ 0	\$ (1,528,254)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ (1,528,254)	\$ 0	\$ (1.1859)
Startrans	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 72,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 58,531,558</b>	<b>\$ 30,623,327</b>	<b>\$ 30,623,327</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>

## June 01, 2010 TAC Rates

### Based on Filed Annual TRR/TRBA and Load Data

**STEP 4: For Information Only -- Projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge for New Facilities and Total projected annual net benefits/burdens from Access Charge.**

	Filed Annual TRR New HV Facilities (\$) [41] =[2]	ISO Wide Annual Gross Load (MWh) [42] =[3]	New HVTRR Rate (\$/MWh) [43] =[15]/[16]	New HVTRR Cost Responsibility (\$) [44] =[42] * [43]	NHVF Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [45] =[44] - [41]	Total Access Charge (Benefit)/Burden (\$) [46] =[45] + [39]
PGE	\$ 209,625,978	90,326,715	\$ 2.6527	\$ 239,612,715	\$ 29,986,737	\$ 49,583,079
SCE	\$ 256,982,193	89,286,280	\$ 2.6527	\$ 236,852,718	\$ (20,129,475)	\$ (533,133)
SDGE	\$ 58,598,134	21,965,835	\$ 2.6527	\$ 58,269,509	\$ (328,625)	\$ 4,570,461
Anaheim	\$ -	2,766,313	\$ 2.6527	\$ 7,338,292	\$ 7,338,292	\$ (9,550,162)
Azusa	\$ -	239,575	\$ 2.6527	\$ 635,529	\$ 635,529	\$ (400,200)
Banning	\$ -	139,457	\$ 2.6527	\$ 369,942	\$ 369,942	\$ (439,313)
Pasadena	\$ -	1,295,096	\$ 2.6527	\$ 3,435,545	\$ 3,435,545	\$ (6,367,816)
Riverside	\$ -	2,201,147	\$ 2.6527	\$ 5,839,057	\$ 5,839,057	\$ (9,715,913)
Vernon	\$ -	1,288,684	\$ 2.6527	\$ 3,418,535	\$ 3,418,535	\$ 3,418,535
Atlantic P15	\$ 30,565,537	0	\$ 2.6527	\$ 0	\$ (30,565,537)	\$ (30,565,537)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 555,771,842</b>	<b>209,509,102</b>		<b>\$ 555,771,842</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>