

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

Application of Southern California Edison  
Company (U 338-E) To Establish Marginal  
Costs, Allocate Revenues, And Design Rates

A.08-03-002  
(Filed March 4, 2008)

In The Matter of the Application of Southern  
California Edison Company (U338-E) for  
Authority to Make Various Electric Rate Design  
Changes.

Application 07-12-020  
(Filed December 21, 2007)

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

JENNIFER TSAO SHIGEKAWA  
BRUCE REED  
MARICRUZ PRADO

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-4183  
Facsimile: (626) 302-6693  
E-mail: [bruce.reed@sce.com](mailto:bruce.reed@sce.com)

Dated: **September 19, 2008**

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

Application of Southern California Edison  
Company (U 338-E) To Establish Marginal  
Costs, Allocate Revenues, And Design Rates

A.08-03-002  
(Filed March 4, 2008)

In The Matter of the Application of Southern  
California Edison Company (U338-E) for  
Authority to Make Various Electric Rate Design  
Changes.

Application 07-12-020  
(Filed December 21, 2007)

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

Pursuant to Rule 8 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission), Southern California Edison Company (SCE) submits this notice. This notice describes the following ex parte communication in the above referenced proceeding.

On September 16, 2008, Gary Schoonyan, SCE Director, and Colin Cushnie, SCE Director, met with Stephen St. Marie and Robert Kinosian, advisors to Commissioner Bohn, at 1:00 p.m. in the Commission's San Francisco offices. The meeting was for one hour, and SCE discussed the proceedings listed in the attached matrix. The meeting was initiated by SCE.

SCE briefly reviewed each of the identified proceedings in the attached matrix and discussed how each proceeding was in conflict or potentially inconsistent with the Commission's apparent movement toward competitive retail markets, least-cost/best fit procurement objective,

and/or previous Commission determinations. SCE requested that the Commission be mindful of how individual proceedings interact with other Commission decisions and objectives.

To request a copy of this notice, please contact: Henry Romero at (626) 302-4124 or email address [Henry.Romero@sce.com](mailto:Henry.Romero@sce.com).

Respectfully submitted,

JENNIFER TSAO SHIGEKAWA  
BRUCE REED  
MARICRUZ PRADO

By       /S/BRUCE REED      

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-4183  
Facsimile: (626) 302-6693  
E-mail: [bruce.reed@sce.com](mailto:bruce.reed@sce.com)

Dated: **September 19, 2008**

**MATTERS WHERE THE CPUC IS TAKING INCONSISTENT POSITIONS**

<b>MATTER OR PROCEEDING</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF INCONSISTENCY</b>
<p>DA OIR (R.07-05-025)</p> <p>A.07-01-047 (SDG&amp;E Rate Design Proceeding)</p> <p>CCA – Community Choice Aggregation</p> <p>(SCE 2009 GRC Phase 2)</p>	<p>In the DA OIR, the Commission is looking to accelerate the reopening of DA by facilitating the novation/assignment of all of the DWR contracts. This would presumably trigger the end of the Direct Access (DA) suspension pursuant to AB 1X because DWR would no longer be supplying power to retail customers. At the same time, ALJ Wong recently issued a proposed decision in SDG&amp;E’s Rate Case finding that the AB 1X cap on residential Tier 1 and Tier 2 rates cannot be lifted until the DWR bonds have been repaid, asserting that is when the DWR will have “recovered its power costs” pursuant to AB1X. Thus, any revenue increases for residential customers must be reflected in residential rates for Tier 3 and above (higher usage customers) until the Commission confirms that the Tier 1 and Tier 2 residential rates can be raised. This creates a situation where high usage residential customers are being charged rates significantly higher than cost-of-service from the utilities, which will lead to uneconomic bypass of SCE’s bundled customer portfolio and the creation of stranded costs that must still be recovered. SCE has a proposal pending before the Commission in Phase 2 of its 2009 GRC to redesign residential rates to address this issue.</p>
<p>2008 LTPP Proceeding</p> <p>DA OIR (R.07-05-025)</p>	<p>The Commission’s scoping memo for the 2008 LTPP proceeding places a lot of emphasis on integrated resource planning and new generation needs for system requirements. Both concepts are applicable for a vertically integrated utility, but are inconsistent with a retail competition model. The Commission must decide which model it prefers; (1) reliance on competitive wholesale and retail markets to produce efficient results in compliance with state policy requirements, or (2) a centrally-planned outcome designed to achieve the state’s policy objectives that does not accommodate retail competition.</p>

<p>Resource Adequacy (R.05-12-013 and R.08-01-025)</p>	<p>The Commission is considering the appropriate long-term framework for the Resource Adequacy (RA) program in “Track 2” of R.05-12-013. In that proceeding, the Energy Division has issued two proposals: one that incorporates a capacity market framework and one for a bilateral-only framework. The capacity market design proposed by the Energy Division includes a “Preliminary Capacity Showing” (PCS), in which only the IOUs would have to demonstrate that they have acquired, 6 months prior to each annual capacity market auction, at least 90% of their forecast peak demand. Such a mandatory IOU-only hedging requirement is not consistent with the implementation of a competitive capacity market and would not place IOUs on a level playing field with other LSEs, especially in the face of the potential reopening of DA. In addition, differential RA requirements for IOUs versus ESPs is inconsistent with the mandate of AB 380 that RA requirements be implemented in a nondiscriminatory fashion for all LSEs. The second Energy Division option – continuation of the bilateral-only RA construct for the long-term – is not sustainable in the long-term, as it relies on the IOUs to acquire needed new system resources and does not protect against future Commission’s allowing departing customers to avoid costs incurred on their behalf.</p>
<p>Non-Bypassable Charges (NBC) Proceeding (Phase III of R.06-02-013)</p>	<p>Despite previous representations that all customers benefit from new generation developed by IOUs for system requirements, the Commission’s D.08-09-012 would allow municipal departing load (MDL) and customer generation departing load (CGDL) to avoid an IOU’s new generation uplift charges; Direct Access and Community Choice Aggregation customers would still remain responsible. If adopted, the change in policy would upset a fundamental understanding of the sanctity of cost recovery for system reliability procurement that the Commission requires the IOUs to perform, and will call into question the ability of the IOUs to recover similar system costs from all customers.</p>

<p>Community Choice Aggregation (R.03-10-003)</p>	<p>The Commission's recent decisions would allow a CCA community to avoid liability for their energy supplier's default, and pass the default procurement risk to all bundled customers. If the Commission is interested in facilitating meaningful, sustainable retail competition, it must require all departing load to be fully responsible for its procurement actions and risks, and not allow significant default risk associated with departing load to reside with the remaining bundled customers.</p>
<p>Debt Equivalence 2006 LTPP Decision</p>	<p>The CPUC has designed IOU bundled customer procurement policy to favor shorter-term commitments to ensure IOUs don't "crowd-out" preferred resources such as Energy Efficiency (EE), Demand Response (DR), and renewable. Additionally, this prevents IOUs from "crowding out" direct access and retail competition by minimizing stranded costs. A second Commission objective has been to procure "least-cost" resources. In contrast, the Commission made a "last minute" change to its 2006 LTPP Decision to preclude the use of debt equivalence bid adders by the IOUs in analyzing bids. By eliminating the use of DE bid adders in PPA valuations, the Commission has prevented the IOUs from accurately assessing the cost of bids and is perversely favoring longer-term and higher cost contracts. There is currently a PFM seeking to correct this inconsistency, but unless the Commission acts favorably on it, the prohibition of using DE bid adders is counter to Commission policy to engage in least cost/best fit procurement.</p>
<p>Adjustments to the MPR Methodology (R.06-02-012)</p>	<p>In the RPS OIR (Phase II), the Commission has made adjustments to the MPR methodology that have resulted in increases to the MPR. Such adjustments include decreasing the capacity factor of the MPR proxy plant and including a GHG adder. The Commission is considering more adjustments that would further raise the MPR for 2008. At the same time, the Commission has expressed increasing concern over the ever rising cost of renewable energy, especially in the context of RPS contract approvals. It makes little sense to exert pressure on the IOUs to procure low-cost renewable energy, while simultaneously increasing a regulatory price referent that has been widely accepted as a price target by the renewable industry.</p>

<p>Misalignment of Shareholder and Customer Interest (R.06-05-027)</p>	<p>In the RPS OIR, the Commission has established an interim penalty structure that misaligns the interest of the IOUs' customer from the IOUs' shareholders. The penalty mechanism creates an incentive for the IOUs to pay for renewables at any cost in order to avoid the potential for shareholder penalty. At the same time, the Commission has expressed increasing concern over the ever rising cost of renewable energy. It makes little sense to exert pressure on the IOUs to procure low-cost renewable energy, while simultaneously maintaining the threat of punitive action against the IOUs for failure to meet specified levels of renewable energy.</p>
<p>Increased Barriers to Meeting RPS Goals (R.06-05-027)</p>	<p>In the RPS OIR, the Commission's handling of RPS contract approvals and the establishment of rules implementing the RPS legislation are creating barriers to the development of renewable resources. These barriers come at a time when pressure to meet 20% renewables is mounting. Such barriers include the restrictive criteria proposed by the Commission and continued uncertainty of IOU requirements related to procurement of above-MPR RPS contracts, the increasing amount of information the Energy Division requires for such contract approvals, delays in processing transmission proceedings, the delay in the approval of tradable RECs, and, at times, protracted RPS contract approvals.</p>
<p>Approval of Short-Term RPS Contracts (R.06-02-012)</p>	<p>The Commission has given the IOUs and other LSEs the authority to enter into short-term RPS contracts provided they are at least one month in duration. However, the IOUs are required to submit short-term RPS contracts for Commission approval via advice letter. Other LSEs do not have such a pre-approval requirement. Given the time it takes to obtain approval via advice letter, the IOUs will often not be able to obtain approval of a short-term RPS contract before the contract needs to take effect. This creates a barrier to short-term IOU RPS procurement that other RPS-obligated LSEs do not face. Additionally, the Commission's decision on short-term RPS contracts has been delayed.</p>

<p>Implementation of AB 1969 (R.06-05-027)</p>	<p>In D.07-07-027, the Commission took extraordinary steps to promote feed-in tariffs for renewable generators. The Commission ignored the statutory limits under AB 1969 in favor of a Commission-designed feed-in tariff program. The Commission's program is essentially a standard-offer program for renewables. The Commission is presently looking to expand this program to generators up to 20 MWs. Spending resources to develop these programs will not solve the fundamental barrier to renewable project implementation – transmission interconnection.</p>
<p>QF Matters (R.04-04-025)</p>	<p>In D.07-09-040, the Commission elected to establish standard offer contracts of up to five years for as-available resources, and up to ten years for firm capacity resources. In doing so, the Commission acknowledged that (1) it was under no PURPA obligation to require long-term standard offers; (2) there is no mandated minimum term for PURPA required purchases; and (3) FERC has approved the use of open solicitations for complying with PURPA. The PUC's actions in adopting mandatory standard offer contracts is inconsistent with the "least-cost-best-fit" procurement model and pending market changes as a result of MRTU. It also does not make sense to force the utilities to offer long-term standard-offer contracts in the face of the reopening of DA and an uncertain customer base. Additionally, the QFs are receiving preferential contracts and are not required to compete against other power producers in utility RFOs.</p>
<p>Demand Response Rulemaking (R.07-01-041)</p>	<p>The Commission is appropriately considering the operation of emergency-triggered DR programs in future wholesale electricity markets. However, the Commission is also reluctant to consider new emergency-triggered DR programs in conflict with the Preferred Loading Order while it undertakes this consideration. The Preferred Loading Order is clear that cost effective energy efficiency and demand response should be optimized before considering conventional generation resources.</p>

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that, pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have this day served a true copy of the **NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E)** on all parties identified on the attached service list(s). Service was effected by one or more means indicated below:

Transmitting the copies via e-mail to all parties who have provided an e-mail address. First class mail will be used if electronic service cannot be effectuated.

Executed this 19<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2008, at Rosemead, California.

/S/HENRY ROMERO \_\_\_\_\_

**HENRY ROMERO**

Project Analyst

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770



California Public  
Utilities Commission

CPUC Home

## CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

### Service Lists

**PROCEEDING: A0803002 - APPLICATION OF SOUTH  
FILER: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
LIST NAME: LIST  
LAST CHANGED: SEPTEMBER 18, 2008**

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

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

## Parties

KEITH MCCREA  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
SUTHERLAND ASHILL & BRENNAN  
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2415  
FOR: CA MANUFACTURERS & TECHNOLOGY

RANDALL W. KEEN  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP  
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD.  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90064  
FOR: LOS ANGELES COUNTY

S. NANCY WHANG  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP  
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD.  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90064  
FOR: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL

GREGORY S.G. KLATT  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
411E. HUNTINGTON DRIVE NO.107-356  
ARCADIA, CA 91006  
FOR: ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL ENERGY MARKETS

MARICRUZ PRADO  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
PO BOX 800, 2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770  
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

R. OLIVIA SAMAD  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
PO BOX 800  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770  
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

KENDALL H. MACVEY, ESQ.  
BEST, BEST & KRIEGER, LLP  
3750 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SUITE 300  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501-1028  
FOR: WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF  
GOVERNMENTS

DOUGLAS A. AMES  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
TRANSPHASE SYSTEMS, INC.  
4971 LOS PATOS AVENUE  
HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA 92649  
FOR: TRANSPHASE CO.

PAUL KERKORIAN  
UTILITY COST MANAGEMENT LLC  
6475 N. PALM AVENUE, SUITE 105

HAYLEY GOODSON  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

FRESNO, CA 93704  
 FOR: (CITRUC PACKERS) PLEASANT VALLEY  
 RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT/ PARAMOUNT  
 CITRUS/ LIMONEIRA COMPANY/ LO BUE  
 BROS., INC.

711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102  
 FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

PAUL ANGELOPULO  
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
 LEGAL DIVISION  
 ROOM 5031  
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214  
 FOR: DRA

NORMAN J. FURUTA  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES  
 1455 MARKET ST., SUITE 1744  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103-1399  
 FOR: FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

NORA SHERIFF  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
 120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104  
 FOR: ENERGY PRODUCERS AND USERS  
 COALITION

ANDREW L. NIVEN  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
 77 BEALE STREET, SUITE 3109  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC

DAVID L. HUARD  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP  
 ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 30TH FLOOR  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
 FOR: LOWE'S HOME IMPROVEMENT

THOMAS J. MACBRIDE, JR.  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP  
 505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
 FOR: BUILDING OWNERS AND MANAGERS  
 ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA

SHIRLEY WOO  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
 PO BOX 7442  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120  
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC

DAVID J. BYERS, ESQ.  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 MCCracken, BYERS & HAESLOOP, LLP  
 1920 LESLIE STREET  
 SAN MATEO, CA 94403  
 FOR: CALIFORNIA CITY-COUNTY STREET  
 LIGHT ASSOCIATION CAL-SLA

BILL F. ROBERTS, PH. D.  
 ECONOMIC SCIENCES CORPORATION  
 1516 LEROY AVENUE  
 BERKELEY, CA 94708  
 FOR: BUILDING OWNERS AND MANAGERS  
 ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA (BOMA)

R. THOMAS BEACH  
 CROSSBORDER ENERGY  
 2560 NINTH STREET, SUITE 213A  
 BERKELEY, CA 94710-2557  
 FOR: SOLAR ALLIANCE

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

SCOTT BLAISING  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN P.C.  
 915 L STREET, STE. 1270  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
 FOR: SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY POWER AUTHORITY

RONALD LIEBERT  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION  
 2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95833  
 FOR: CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

## Information Only

---

KHOJASTEH DAVOODI  
 UTILITY RATES AND STUDIES OFFICE  
 1322 PATTERSON AVENUE SE

LARRY R. ALLEN  
 UTILITY RATES AND STUDIES OFFICE  
 SUITE 1000

WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, DC 20374-5018

1322 PATTERSON AVENUE SE  
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, DC 20374-5065

RALPH E. DENNIS  
DENNIS CONSULTING  
2805 BITTERSWEET LANE  
LA GRANGE, KY 40031

JIM ROSS  
RCS, INC.  
500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, SUITE 320  
CHESTERFIELD, MO 63017

MAURICE BRUBAKER  
BRUBAKER & ASSOCIATES, INC.  
1215 FERN RIDGE PARKWAY, SUITE 208  
ST. LOUIS, MO 63141

KEVIN J. SIMONSEN  
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES  
646 EAST THIRD AVENUE  
DURANGO, CO 81301

CASE ADMINISTRATION  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, ROOM 370  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770  
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

JENNIFER ALDERETE  
CASE ADMINISTRATOR  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
PO BOX 800, 244 WALNUT GROVE AVE  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770  
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

JENNIFER SHIGEKAWA  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770  
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

KELLY M. FOLEY  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
SEMPRA ENERGY  
101 ASH STREET, HQ12  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3017  
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

DON LIDDELL  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
2928 2ND AVENUE  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103

CAROL MANSON  
REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO.  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT CP32D  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530  
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

DAVID ORTH  
GENERAL MANAGER  
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY POWER AUTHORITY  
4886 EAST JENSEN AVENUE  
FRESNO, CA 93725  
FOR: SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY POWER AUTHORITY

MICHEL P. FLORIO  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)  
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE.350  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

NINA SUETAKE  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
711 VAN NESS AVE., STE. 350  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

ROBERT FINKELSTEIN  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
711 VAN NESS AVE., SUITE 350  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

DANIEL PEASE  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET; B10A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103  
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

EVELYN KAHL  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104  
FOR: ENERGY USERS AND PRODUCER'S  
COALITION

KAREN TERRANOVA  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, STE 2200  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

EDWARD G. POOLE  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ANDERSON, DONOVAN & POOLE  
601 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1300  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108-2818

JOSEPH F. WIEDMAN  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900

STEVEN GREENWALD  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EDWARD W. O'NEILL  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-6533

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS  
425 DIVISADERO STREET, STE 303  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

CASE COORDINATION  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
PO BOX 770000; MC B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177  
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH  
BARKOVICH & YAP, INC.  
PO BOX 11031  
OAKLAND, CA 94611

MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.  
1814 FRANKLIN STREET, SUITE 720  
OAKLAND, CA 94612  
FOR: MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.

DOCKET COORDINATOR  
5727 KEITH ST.  
OAKLAND, CA 94618

REED V. SCHMIDT  
BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES  
1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE  
BERKELEY, CA 94703-2714

WENDY L. ILLINGWORTH  
ECONOMIC INSIGHTS  
320 FEATHER LANE  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060

BILL MARCUS  
JBS ENERGY  
311 D STREET, STE. A  
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA 95605

RICHARD MCCANN, PH.D  
M. CUBED  
2655 PORTAGE BAY ROAD, SUITE 3  
DAVIS, CA 95616

ANDREW BROWN  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP  
2015 H STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811

JEDEDIAH J. GIBSON  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP  
2015 H STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811

DANIEL GEIS  
AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSN.  
925 L STREET, SUITE 800  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
FOR: AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSUMERS  
ASSOCIATION.

RYAN BERNARDO  
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN, P.C.  
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

KAREN LINDH  
LINDH & ASSOCIATES  
7909 WALERGA ROAD, SUITE 112, PMB 119  
ANTELOPE, CA 95843

## State Service

---

AMY C. YIP-KIKUGAWA  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES  
ROOM 2106  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DEXTER E. KHOURY  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS BRA  
ROOM 4209  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214  
FOR: DRA

DINA S. MACKIN  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ENERGY DIVISION  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE

DONALD J. LAFRENTZ  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ENERGY DIVISION  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214  
FOR: ENERGY

ERIC GREENE  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ENERGY DIVISION  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

FELIX ROBLES  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
POLICY & DECISION ANALYSIS BRANCH  
AREA 3-F  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ROBERT BENJAMIN  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ENERGY DIVISION  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

---

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