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

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding	)	
Policies, Procedures and Incentives for	)	RULEMAKING 04-03-017
Distributed Generation and Distributed	Ś	(Filed March 16, 2004)
Energy Resources.	j	,,
	j	CEC Docket No. 04-DIST-GEN-1
	j	and 03-IEP-1
	í	•

# REPLY COMMENTS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) ON DRAFT ORDER TO MODIFY THE SELF GENERATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND IMPLEMENT ASSEMBLY BILL 1685

MICHAEL D. MONTOYA AMBER E, DEAN

Attorneys for SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue

Post Office Box 800

Rosemead, California 91770

Telephone:

(626) 302-6057

Facsimile:

(626) 302-7740

E-mail:

Mike.Montoya@SCE.com

Dated: November 15, 2004

04-DIST-GEN-1
DOCKET
03-IEP-1
DATE NOV 1 5 2004
RECD. NOV 1 6 2004

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Secti	ion	<u>Title</u>	Page
I.	INTR	ODUCTION	1
п.	REPL	Y COMMENTS	2
	A.	SCE Opposes Increasing the Level 1 Incentive	2
	В.	SCE Supports the Commission's Decision to Adopt Staff Recommendations on Verification of AB 1685 Emissions Requirements.	3
	C.	SCE Reiterates the SGIP Working Group's Request for Clarification of the AB 1685 Minimum Efficiency Requirement.	4
	D.	SCE Supports the DD's Proposal for Stakeholder Workshops	4
III.	CONC	CLUSION	5

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding	)	
Policies, Procedures and Incentives for	)	RULEMAKING 04-03-017
Distributed Generation and Distributed	<b>)</b> .	(Filed March 16, 2004)
Energy Resources.	)	,
	j	CEC Docket No. 04-DIST-GEN-1
	j	and 03-IEP-1
	)	

# REPLY COMMENTS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) ON DRAFT ORDER TO MODIFY THE SELF GENERATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND IMPLEMENT ASSEMBLY BILL 1685

#### I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

SCE has long supported cost-effective Distributed Generation (DG) and will continue to do so, consistent with the goals of the California Legislature and this Commission. This does not mean, however, that SCE is compelled to blindly support the continued efforts of some DG participants to institutionalize a DG subsidy at the expense of utility ratepayers. The Self Generation Incentive Program (SGIP) was originally conceived during the California Electricity Crisis to encourage the use of DG as a way of curtailing demand for electricity and reducing load during peak and not as a means to sustain the DG industry. Half a billion dollars of ratepayer money was earmarked to encourage customers to utilize distributed generation with the expectation that all ratepayers would benefit from a greater reliance on self-generation. AB 1685 expanded this budget to \$875 million through the end of 2007.

For instance, in objecting to the reduction in the incentive for Level-1 from \$4.50/watt to \$3.00/watt, Powerlight Corporation (Powerlight) stated, "There is no market evidence to suggest that the PV industry could adapt to, much less thrive with this proposed 33% drop in rebate levels." Powerlight Comments, p.2. VoteSolar goes so far as to recommend that the CPUC "Order the Working Group to determine an exit strategy that creates a sustainable solar industry in California." VoteSolar Comments, p.1.

Thus, ratepayers have already been asked to shoulder \$875 million in direct subsidies without any cost-benefit showing. Parties now seek through their comments to expand the SGIP program, notwithstanding the fact that there is still no evidence in this or any other record that expansion of the SGIP program beyond that provided in AB 1685 is justified. Given the significant cost to non-participating ratepayers, the Commission should withhold any action to expand the SGIP program<sup>2</sup> until the pending cost-benefit analysis is completed. SCE also takes this opportunity to challenge proposals to (1) increase Level-1 incentives, (2) delay the effective date of the new emissions and efficiency standards, (3) ignore the actual utilization of waste heat at the host site, and (4) restructure the SGIP working group. <sup>2</sup>

#### II. REPLY COMMENTS

#### A. SCE Opposes Increasing the Level 1 Incentive.

Cal SEIA and Powerlight continue to advance the argument that the Level-1 SGIP per-watt rebate levels must remain higher than those offered in the CEC's program because commercial/industrial/government customers have much lower energy costs than residential customers. This argument is seriously flawed.

Cal SEIA takes issue with SCE's position that increased SGIP funding is unnecessary in SCE's territory due to a current over collection of approximately \$92 million. Cal SEIA claims that this is due to information on SCE's website concerning available SGIP funds, and that the Commission should "investigate" the "lack of participation" in SCE's territory. Such an investigation is unnecessary. As SCE stated in its opening comments, currently, more than 50% of the projects in SCE's territory drop out before completion and before being allocated any SGIP funds. SCE Comments, pp. 6-7. As such, SCE's website makes clear that SCE is still accepting applications for the SGIP program. SCE will update its website consistent with the DD (pp.8-9) to include the amount of funds reserved, paid, and available in each level, funds transferred between levels, and installed and reserved generating capacity.

Because of page limitations, SCE could only respond to some of the issues raised by the parties that seriously depart from the original intent of the legislature and the Commission's development of the SGIP. Thus, SCE's silence in any particular subject area should not indicate its acceptance of the position(s) presented. For example, SCE opposes but could not specifically address proposals to move funds between administrators. Additionally, SCE supports the Working Group's comments, as well as PG&E's and SDG&E's comments.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> For instance, Cal SEIA states at page 3 of its comments that "the residential rate in California IOU service territories is twice that of commercial rates resulting in very different customer Continued on the next page

First, the rates cited by both parties in their comments are simply not accurate. Small/Medium Industrial customer rates are higher than residential rates. Moreover, the fact that commercial & industrial customers may have recently been able to enjoy reductions in energy prices should not serve as justification to increase the subsidy levels. Second, contrary to Cal SEIA's belief that incentives should be based on a customer's "rate and investment structure," incentive levels were correctly established based on installed costs. The fact that various customers have different motives or incentives for investment is immaterial. Third, incentive levels for DG intended for commercial, industrial and government customers should be lower than incentives provided for small commercial and residential customers in the CEC's program because the project costs are likely to be lower due to the size of the installations.

### B. <u>SCE Supports the Commission's Decision to Adopt Staff Recommendations on Verification of AB 1685 Emissions Requirements.</u>

SCE concurs with the recommendation to adopt the Energy Division's recommended methods for verifying a DG unit's emissions through (1) CARB certification, or (2) submitting manufacturer specifications, submitting a permit to operate, and submitting project-specific efficiency calculations. Requests from CEERT and CCDC that the Commission develop details on "sufficient" manufacturer emission specifications are not needed. AB 1685 and the Commission provided sufficient detail for the implementation program requirements.

The Commission should not adopt CCDC's proposal to delay the effective date of the new emissions and efficiency requirements by 90 days after the handbook revisions are adopted. According to the plain language of AB 1685, the emission requirements are

Continued from the previous page economics and incentive requirements." Powerlight claims that "the higher avoided utility costs for residential customers allow the residential solar market to thrive with lower per Watt rebate levels." Powerlight Comments, p.3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Cal SEIA Comments, p. 3.

Powerlight acknowledges this: "Economies of scale on the commercial side result in lower installed cost for the end-use customer and long-term savings..." Powerlight Comments, p.3.

effective January 1, 2005. Nor should the Commission require development of promoting mechanisms for those technologies that cannot meet the new emission standards. SCE supports the intent of AB 1685 to encourage participation of cleaner generating technologies in the program. AB 1685 did not intend to provide dirtier combustion technologies "time to catch-up" or mechanisms for allowing ineligible technologies to participate while delaying or displacing implementation of clean generators.

### C. <u>SCE Reiterates the SGIP Working Group's Request for Clarification of the AB 1685 Minimum Efficiency Requirement.</u>

SCE believes that Public Utilities Code section 218.5 waste heat utilization requirements are still required, along with the AB 1685 efficiency standard to ensure that sufficient waste heat is utilized to maintain high fossil fuel efficiency. However, SCE recognizes that AB 1685 does not specifically address the retention of PUC 218.5 requirements in future program years, and therefore requests clarification that this requirement will be retained until it is verified that AB 1685 is at least as stringent as PUC 218.5.7

Compliance with PUC 218.5 has been an issue in past projects. According to Itron's Third-Year Impact Assessment Report, preliminary data suggests the possibility of systemic negative variance between planned and actual system efficiencies. Only 2 of 20 monitored Level-3 cogeneration systems appear likely to achieve the 42.5% PUC 218.5 (b) efficiency on an annual basis.§

#### D. SCE Supports the DD's Proposal for Stakeholder Workshops.

SCE fully supports the Draft order's proposal for stakeholder workshops to establish a waiting-list protocol, a declining rebate strategy, an exit strategy, and a data release

SCE objects to UTC's and CCDC's proposal to base the AB 1685 efficiency requirement on manufacturer specifications alone and not address the actual utilization of the waste heat at the proposed Host Customer site.

See the CPUC Self Generation Incentive Program Third Year Impacts Assessment Report, pp. 10-15.

format. These workshops will enhance collaboration among stakeholders. SCE, however, objects to the expansion of the SGIP Working Group (WG) to include non-administrator stakeholders, and opposes the use of ratepayer funds to pay stakeholders to participate in SGIP workshops. The Commission established the WG to implement policy and program design and ensure uniform implementation of the program in all of the administrator service territories. Contrary to some of the submitted comments, the WG was not established to debate, discuss or develop new policy or new program designs. Expanding the WG to include non-administrators will not serve the purpose of improving the policy and program design, but will only result in protracted debate about implementation details.

#### III. CONCLUSION

SCE respectfully requests the Commission modify the DD consistent with these and SCE's Opening Comments.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL D. MONTOYA

AMBER E. DEAN

By: Michael D. Montoya

Attorneys for SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue

Post Office Box 800

Rosemead, California 91770

Telephone:

(626) 302-6057

Facsimile:

(626) 302-7740

E-mail:

Mike.Montoya@SCE.com

November 15, 2004

<sup>9</sup> D.01-03-073 (March 27, 2001).

See, e.g., Cal SEIA Comments, p. 7; Powerlight Comments, p.4.

#### 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 Reply Comments of Southern California Edison
Company (U 338-E) on Draft Order to Modify the Self Generation Incentive Program and
Implement Assembly Bill 1685 on all parties identified on the attached service list(s).
Service was effected by one or more means indicated below:

- Placing the copies in properly addressed sealed envelopes and depositing such envelopes in the United States mail with first-class postage prepaid (Via First Class Mail):
  - To all parties, or
  - To those parties without e-mail addresses or whose e-mails are returned as undeliverable;
- Placing the copies in sealed envelopes and causing such envelopes to be delivered by hand or by overnight courier to the offices of the Commission or the other addressee(s);
- Transmitting the copies via e-mail to all parties who have provided an address.

Executed this 15th day of November, 2004, at Rosemead, California.

cki Carr-Donerson

Case Analyst

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

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

SCOTT J. ANDERS DIRECTOR OF POLICY AND PLANNING SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE 8520 TECH WAY - SUITE 110 SAN DIEGO, CA 92123 R.04-03-017

DEVRA BACHRACH NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL 111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 R.04-03-017 BARBARA R. BARKOVICH BARKOVICH AND YAP, INC. 44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE MENDOCINO, CA 95460 R.04-03-017

Valerie Beck CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214 R.04-03-017 Werner M. Blumer CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214 B.04-03-017

ANDREW B. BROWN ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP 2015 H STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 R.04-03-017

PETRINA BURNHAM SDG&E/SOCAL GAS 8330 CENTURY PARK CT., CP32D SAN DIEGO, CA 92123 R.04-03-017 SEAN CASEY SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSIO 1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103 R.04-03-017

CENTRAL FILES SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC 8330 CENTURY PARK COURT SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530-1530 R.04-03-017

STEVE CHADIMA ENERGY INNOVATIONS, INC. 130 WEST UNION STREET PASADENA, CA 91103 R.04-03-017 ALEXANDER G. CHEN THERMAL MANAGEMENT GROUP UNITED TECHNOLOGIES RESEARCH CENTER 411 SILVER LANE, MS129-16 E. HARTFORD, CT 6108 R.04-03-017

JILL K. CLIBURN 45 CRAZY RABBIT DRIVE SANTA FE, NM 87508 R.04-03-017

JOE COMO CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, RM. 234 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 R04-03-017

STEVE COONEN CONNECT ENERGY 14790 MOSSWOOD LANE GRASS VALLEY, CA 95945 R.04-03-017 REGINA M. DEANGELIS ATTORNEY AT LAW CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE, ROOM 4107 ROOM 4107 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 R.04-03-017

CHRISTOPHER T. ELLISON ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS 2015 H STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 R.04-03-017 ROB ERLICHMAN SUNLIGHT ELECTRIC, LLC 57 ASHBURY STREET, 6 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117 R.04-03-017 DIANE I. FELLMAN ATTORNEY AT LAW LAW OFFICES OF DIANE I. FELLMAN 234 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 R.04-03-017

SUSAN FREEDMAN SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE 8520 TECH WAY, SUITE 110 SAN DIEGO, CA 92123 R.04-03-017 JOHN GALLOWAY UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS 2397 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 203 BERKELEY, CA 94704 R.04-03-017 SYLVIA D. GARDNER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177-0001
R.04-03-017

BRENDA GETTIG REGIONAL ECONOMIC RESEARCH, INC. 11236 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2650 R.04-03-017

STEVEN A. GREENBERG DISTRIBUTED ENERGY STRATEGIES 4100 ORCHARD CANYON LANE VACAVILLE, CA 95688 R.04-03-017 Maxine Harrison EXECUTIVE DIVISION CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500 LOS ANGELES, CA 90013 R.04-03-017

Mohammad Hassanpour CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214 R.04-03-017

MICHAEL HALL BORREGO SOLAR SYSTEMS 2512 9TH ST, SUITE 6 BERKELEY, CA 94710 R.04-03-017 GLENN HAMER DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS FIRST SOLAR ELECTRIC COMPANY 4050 E. COTTON CENTER BLVD., STE. 68 PHOENIX, AZ 85040-8864 R.04-03-017

ARNO HARRIS PREVALENT POWER, INC. 20 GALLI DR., SUITE 8 NOVATO, CA 94949 R.04-03-017 Martin Homec CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 4205 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214 R.04-03-017 DARCIE L. HOUCK STAFF COUNSEL CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION 1516 9TH STREET, MS 34 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512 R.04-03-017

HEATHER HUNT W.H. ROBERT & H.F. HUNT, LLC 242 WHIPPOORWILL LANE STRATFORD, CT 6614 R.04-03-017 MICHAEL HYAMS SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM 1155 MARKET ST., 4/F SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103 R.04-03-017 RONALD K. ISHII AESC, INC. 1945 CAMINO VIDA ROBLE, SUITE A CARLSBAD, CA 92008 R.04-03-017

ROB JOHANNSEN DIRECTOR OF MARKETING FIRST SOLAR ELECTRIC COMPANY, LLC 4050 E. COTTON CENTER BLVD., STE. 68 PHOENIX, AZ 85040-8864 R.04-03-017 MARTIN KAY PROGRAM SUPERVISOR SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTR 21865 COPLEY DR. DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765-3252 R.04-03-017

GREG KENNEDY OCCIDENTAL POWER SOLAR AND COGENERATION 3629 TARAVAL ST. SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116 R.04-03-017

DONALD C. LIDDELL, P.C. DOUGLASS & LIDDELL 2928 2ND AVENUE SAN DIEGO, CA 92103 R.04-03-017 RONALD LIEBERT ATTORNEY AT LAW CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION 2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE SACRAMENTO, CA 95833 R.04-03-017

KAREN LINDH LINDH & ASSOCIATES 7909 WALERGA ROAD, NO. 112, PMB 119 ANTELOPE, CA 95843 R.04-03-017

RANDY LITTENEKER ATTORNEY AT LAW PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PO BOX 7442 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120 R.04-03-017

JODY S. LONDON GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES 582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 R.04-03-017 Kim Malcolm CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 5005 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214 R.04-03-017

RACHEL MACDONALD CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION 1516 NINTH STREET, MS 43 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 R.04-03-017 KEITH MCCREA ATTORNEY AT LAW SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN 1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2415 R.04-03-017 KARLY MCCRORY CONTRACTS ADMINISTRATOR RWE SCHOTT SOLAR INC. 4051 ALVIS COURT, SUITE 1 ROCKLIN, CA 95677 R.04-03-017

JACK P. MCGOWAN GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES 582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 R.04-03-017 DAVID MCMANUS SENIOR PROGRAMS MANAGER GREEN ONSITE DIVISION 1004 OREILLY STREET SUITE 300A SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94129 R.04-03-017

MICHAEL D. MONTOYA SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY 2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE ROSEMEAD, CA 91770 R.04-03-017

JERRY MOORE CONNECT ENERGY 3625 CINCINNATI AVENUE ROCKLIN, CA 95765 R.04-03-017 CLYDE S. MURLEY GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES 582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 R.04-03-017 MEGAN MACNEIL MYERS LAW OFFICES OF SARA STECK MYERS 122 28TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121 R.04-03-017

SARA STECK MYERS ATTORNEY AT LAW 122 - 28TH AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121 R.04-03-017 FREDERICK M. ORTLIEB ATTORNEY AT LAW CITY OF SAN DIEGO - OFFICE OF CITY ATTOR 1200 THIRD AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR SAN DIEGO, CA 92101 R.04-03-017 STEVEN D. PATRICK ATTORNEY AT LAW SEMPRA ENERGY 555 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 1400 LOS ANGELES, CA 90013 R.04-03-017

NORMAN A. PEDERSEN ATTORNEY AT LAW HANNA AND MORTON LLP 444 SOUTH FLOWER STREET, SUITE 1500 LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2916 8 04-03-037

MARK RAWSON CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION 1516 NINTH STREET, MS 43 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 R.04-03-017 Steven C Ross CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214 R.04-03-017

KEITH ROBERTS
CITY ENERGY MANAGER
CITY OF SACRAMENTO
927 10TH STREET, 300, GENERAL SERVICES
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
RM422017

JAMES ROSS RCS CONSULTING, INC. 500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, SUITE 320 CHESTERFIELD, MO 63017 R.04-03-017

JP ROSS 182 SECOND STREET, SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105 R.04-03-017

Funda Emine Saygin CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 1350 FRONT ST., STATE BLDG. ROOM 4006 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101 R.04-03-017 Don Schultz
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050
RM. SCTO
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.04-03-017

LORI SMITH SCHELL PH.D. EMPOWERED ENERGY N. ELK RUN DURANGO, CO 81303 R.04-03-017

NORA SHERIFF ATTORNEY AT LAW ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP 120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 R.04-03-017

MARK SHIRILAU ALOHA SYSTEMS, INC. 14801 COMET STREET IRVINE, CA 92604-2464 R.04-03-017 Donald R Smith CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214 R.04-03-017

KARI SMITH POWERLIGHT CORPORATION 2954 SAN PABLO AVENUE BERKELEY, CA 94706 R.04-03-017 KAREN TERRANOVA ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP 120 MONTGOMERY STREET, STE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 R.04-03-017 DAN THOMPSON SUN POWER & GEOTHERMAL ENERGY CO. INC. 863 E. FRANCISCO BLVD. SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901 R.04-03-017

SCOTT TOMASHEFSKY CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION 1516 - 9TH STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 R.04-03-017 ANN L. TROWBRIDGE ATTORNEY AT LAW DOWNEY BRAND LLP 555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLOOR SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 B.04-03-017

DANIEL TUNNICLIFF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON 2244 WALNUT GROVE ROSEMEAD, CA 91770 R.04-03-017

JANE H. TURNBULL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CA 64 LOS ALTOS SQUARE LOS ALTOS, CA 94022 R.04-03-017 Bradford Wetstone CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214 R.04-03-017

LISA WEINZIMER CALIFORNIA ENERGY CIRCUIT 695 NINTH AVENUE, NO. 2 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118 R.04-03-017

RYAN WISER BERKELEY LAB ONE CYCLOTRON ROAD BERKELEY, CA 94720 R.04-03-017 VIKKI WOOD PRINCIPAL DEMAND-SIDE SPECIALIST SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT 6301 S STREET, MS A103 SACRAMENTO, CA 95618-1899 R.04-03-017

CATHERINE E. YAP BARKOVICH & YAP, INC. PO BOX 11031 OAKLAND, CA 94611 R.04-03-017

LEGAL & REGULATORY DEPARTMENT CALIFORNIA ISO 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM, CA 95630 R.04-03-017

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS 517-B POTRERO AVE. SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110-1431 R.04-03-017 CASE ADMINISTRATION SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY 2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, RM.370 ROSEMEAD, CA 91770 R.04-03-017

MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC 1999 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 1440 OAKLAND, CA 94612-3517 R.04-03-017