

DOCKET	
07-OIIP-1	
DATE	JAN 07 2008
RECD.	JAN 07 2008

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement the
Commission's Procurement Incentive Framework
and to Examine the Integration of Greenhouse
Gas Emissions Standards into Procurement
Policies.

Rulemaking 06-04-009
(Filed April 13, 2006)

BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

In The Matter Of,

AB 32 Implementation – Greenhouse Gas
Emissions.

Docket 07-OIIP-01

RESPONSE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY TO JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING COMMENTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING COMMENTS ON MODELING-RELATED ISSUES

MICHAEL D. MONTAYA
LAURA L. GENAO
CATHY SARLSTAD

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-6842
Facsimile: (626) 302-1935
E-mail. laura.genao@sce.com

Dated: **January 7, 2008**

**RESPONSE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) TO
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING COMMENTS ON MODELING
RELATED ISSUES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Section	Page
I.	RESPONSES TO APPENDIX A OF THE MODELING-RULING (EMISSIONS REDUCTION MEASURES)	2
11.	RESPONSES TO APPENDIX B (E3 GHG CALCULATOR)	6
III.	COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SECTIONS OF APPENDIX B	12
A.	Comments on Modeling Methodology for Reference Case and Target Cases	12
1.	2008 PLEXOS Data Sources	12
2.	Assigning Generation to LSEs	12
3.	Ensuring Sufficient Resources to Meet Loads	13
B.	Comments on Inputs to E3 Base Case and Target Cases	14
1.	Comments on General Input Assumptions	14
a)	Reference Case Policy Assumptions	14
b)	Financing and Tax Incentive Assumptions for New Resources	15
(1)	Financing Assumptions	15
(2)	Tax Incentive Assumptions	15
c)	Fuel Price Forecasts for the WECC	16
d)	Assumptions Regarding 2020 RPS Requirements in the WECC	16
2	Comments on Load Forecast Assumptions	18
a)	CA LSE and WECC Load and Energy Forecasts	18
3.	Comments on Demand-Side Resources and Costs Assumptions	18
a)	CSI Forecast	18
b)	Demand Response Forecast	19

**RESPONSE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) TO
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING COMMENTS ON MODELING-
RELATED ISSUES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Section	Page
4.	Comments on New Generation Resources and Costs.....	19
a)	Wind Resources, Cost, and Performance.....	20
b)	Biomass Resources, Cost, and Performance.....	21
c)	Geothermal Resources, Cost, and Performance.....	21
d)	Concentrating Solar Power Resources, Cost, and Performance	22
5.	Comments on All-in Resource Costs By Zone	23
a)	Renewable Energy Supply Curves.....	23
b)	Transmission Costs	23
(1)	E3 Appears to Have Reasonably Estimated Transmission Cost Components	24
(2)	E3's Cost Methodology Appears Reasonable.....	24
c)	Wind Integration Costs	26
d)	Firming Costs.....	27
e)	Resource Ranking and Selection	27
f)	California Resource Zones.....	28
6.	Comments on Reference Case and Target Case Results	28
a)	Aggressive Policy Results.....	28
7.	Comments on Model Benchmarking	29
a)	Electricity Sector Emissions Benchmarks	29
8.	Comments on GHG Calculator.....	29
a)	Brief Calculator Description	29
IV.	OTHER	30
A.	Party Information on Generators	30

**RESPONSE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) TO
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING COMMENTS ON MODELING-
RELATED ISSUES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section		Page
V.	CONCLUSION.....	31
	APPENDIX A.....	32

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement the)	
Commission's Procurement Incentive Framework)	Rulemaking 06-04-009
and to Examine the Integration of Greenhouse)	(Filed April 13, 2006)
Gas Emissions Standards into Procurement)	
Policies.)	

BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

In The Matter Of,)	
)	Docket 07-OIIP-01
AB 32 Implementation – Greenhouse Gas)	
Emissions.)	

**RESPONSE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (L 338-E) TO
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING COMMENTS ON
MODELING-RELATED ISSUES**

Pursuant to the "Administrative Law Judges' Ruling Extending Comment Deadlines and Addressing Procedural Matters," issued November 20, 2007, Southern California Edison Company ("SCE") comments on the documentation for the model created by Energy and Environmental Economics, Inc. ("E3") to assess how different methods of reducing greenhouse gases ("GHG") will achieve emission reduction goals for the electricity sector and how such reductions will affect utility costs and consumers' electricity bills.

In order to most fully assess E3's report, SCE has organized its comments to first address the specific questions posed by the "Administrative Law Judges' Ruling Requesting Comments on Modeling-Related Issues," issued November 9, 2007 ("Modeling Ruling"). Following those responses, SCE provides specific comments as necessitated by each section of E3's report. The section headings below each correspond to either a question or section of the report.

I.

RESPONSES TO APPENDIX A OF THE MODELING-RULING (EMISSIONS REDUCTION MEASURES)

Question 1. Does Attachment A cover all of the viable emissions reduction measures available in the electricity and natural gas sectors? If not, what other measures should be considered for the purposes of forecasting emissions reduction potential within these sectors? Please include suggested data sources and references for information regarding any additional measure you propose.

Grid applications are not among the emissions reduction measures addressed in Attachment A. Grid applications are projects that lower electrical losses or reduce greenhouse (“GHG”) emissions through infrastructure changes to the electrical grid (e.g., wires, substation). One example of a grid application is the replacement of existing distribution get-a-ways having aluminum cable with copper cable. Such change may significantly reduce electrical losses and thereby reduce GHG emissions at a cost that is competitive when compared to the cost of alternatives.

Another example of an overlooked, yet potentially competitive, grid application is the replacement of existing lower-voltage facilities, such as transmission lines, with higher operating voltage facilities. A project that increases transmission line voltages from 500 kV to 765 kV could aid the State’s GHG reduction efforts by reducing electrical losses.¹

Additionally, GHG emissions can be reduced by identifying grid projects that can help displace local generation with lower-emitting generation resources. Since average network generation may be lower-emitting than certain specific and existing generation resources, certain grid projects could lead to lower overall emissions as higher-emitting units are displaced.

¹ One reason utilities use high voltage lines is because electrical losses are lower for circuits having higher voltage than for those with lower voltages, if all other things are equal. Accordingly, electrical losses (and therefore emissions) can be reduced if the voltage for 500 kV lines is increased to 765 kV. Transformer losses could also be analyzed. Transformers are large contributors to electrical system losses. Transformers have losses merely by operating, even if no load is being served (no-load losses). Transformers also have load losses which increase with use (called load losses). Total transformer losses are the sum of load and no-load losses. An estimate of the incremental cost of replacing distribution transformers with larger transformers having lower total losses could be performed and compared to other abatement options.

As grid projects were not assessed by E3, their impact has not yet been evaluated. The examples set forth above, and others, should be assessed and, if competitive, added to the State's repertoire of potential emission abatement options.

Question 2. Are there emission reduction measures identified within Attachment A that you believe, based on currently available information, should not be implemented as a means to achieving emission reductions within the context of AB32? Please justify your answer.

SCE has no comment on this question at this time.

Question 3. What means beyond policies currently adopted by the two Commissions hold potential for the delivery of additional energy efficiency?

SCE has no comment on this question at this time.

Question 4. What means beyond policies currently adopted by the two Commissions hold potential for the integration of additional renewable resources into the grid?

SCE strongly recommends that the two Commissions focus their efforts on understanding the grid impacts of increased penetration of the market by renewables; expediting transmission planning, permitting, and construction; authorizing the use of unbundled, tradable renewable energy credits ("RECs") for use when meeting the renewable portfolio standard ("RPS"); and ensuring that responsibility for meeting California's RPS and emissions goals is shared equally among all electric utilities (i.e., investor-owned utilities ("IOUs") and of publicly owned utilities ("POUs"). SCE sets forth the specific challenges each of these suggestions addresses below.

Understanding the grid impacts of increased renewable penetration. Few studies have identified the cost or system effects of higher renewable penetration and how to mitigate such effects on the power grid. The variable output of intermittent resources like wind and solar generation affect frequency and voltage regulation and provide challenges to effectively balancing load and maintaining system reliability. In order to understand the full effect of any

recommendation of increased renewable standards, it is critical that the effect of higher renewable resource levels be more fully understood.

Expediting transmission planning, permitting, and construction. Unavailable transmission continues to be one of the greatest barriers to bringing renewable resources on-line, especially in areas where new renewable resources are considered technically and economically feasible. However, the current pace of transmission planning, permitting, and construction does not support the RPS requirement of ensuring that transmission is available when new resources are ready to come on-line.² Quickening all scheduling aspects of building new transmission facilities would likely help allow maximum integration of renewables into California's resource mix.

Additionally, SCE suggests continued review of options for fixing an already congested and ever growing California Independent System Operator ("CAISO") interconnection queue.

Authorizing the use of unbundled, tradable RECs for RPS compliance. SCE endorses the use of unbundled and tradable RECs as a way of complying with California's RPS legislation.³ RECs provide load-serving entities ("LSEs") with additional flexibility and options when contracting for renewable energy.⁴ Given the importance of the State's RPS goals and current challenges facing LSEs with regard to RPS compliance, the additional flexibility provided by RECs is an important addition to the RPS program that should be authorized by the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC").⁵

² SB 1078 (Sher 2002), codified at Pub. Util. Code Section 399.11 established the Renewable Portfolio Standard and requires annual procurement targets of 1% per year toward achieving this goal.

³ See "Pre-Workshop Comments of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) Regarding Tradable Renewable Energy Credits," filed August 17, 2007, at 1.

⁴ The need for RECs will be exacerbated if new transmission is not built and available by 2020.

⁵ See "Post-Workshop Comments of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) regarding Tradable Renewable Energy Credits," filed November 13, 2007, at 3.

Ensuring responsibility to meet the State's RPS and emissions goals are shared equally among all electric utilities. It is unreasonable and impractical for IOUs and their respective customers to be responsible for the full cost and complete implementation of the State's total RPS and GHG emissions goals. Municipal utilities and their customers should also be held to the same standards as the IOUs and required to contribute equally to California's requirements. The CPUC and California Energy Commission ("CEC") should adopt rules and regulations that will most swiftly enable equitable compliance among all of the State's electric utilities.

Question 5. How might an emissions reduction strategy within the electricity sector be targeted to displace the most carbon intensive aspects of California's electricity resource mix?

A source-based carbon cap is the best way to displace carbon from the State's electricity resource mix. A regional cap and trade system is preferable to a California-only approach and a national system is better than a regional approach because it reduces the potential for leakage and allows consistent measurement and tracking. A cap and trade system would effectively displace the emissions from high carbon intensive emitters because it effectively adds an appropriate level of cost to high GHG emitters. A California first-seller approach in which emissions from plants outside the state become the responsibility of the purchaser at the first point of sale inside California effectively places a higher price on out-of-state high GHG-emitting units. If a regional system were within the realm of possibility to effect the necessary California reductions under Assembly Bill ("AB") 32, such a system would more effectively reduce emissions from high GHG emitters than a California-only system in two ways.

First, a regional/federal source-based cap would reduce or eliminate the susceptibility of California's emissions reduction program to leakage to other states within the Western Electricity Coordinating Council ("WECC"). Reducing leakage is an aim of AB 32 and would

ensure that emission reductions are real and that emissions from power imports are not simply being transferred to other states.

Second, it would allow emitters to utilize the most-effective means of reducing emissions. By granting emitters planning choices, they each become responsible for most cost-effectively managing their emissions. This will lead to lower-carbon choices.

It should be noted that the Western Climate Initiative (“WCI”), while a welcome start to a regional approach, does not encompass the whole of the WECC. Thus, while the WCI would begin to move toward an effective regional approach to controlling GHG emissions from power generation, a much-preferred approach would involve the entire WECC.

II.

RESPONSES TO APPENDIX B (E3 GHG CALCULATOR)

Question 6. Does E3’s modeling documentation adequately document the methodology, inputs and other assumptions underlying its model? If not, what additional documentation should be added?

E3’s modeling documentation does not provide all of the information necessary to assess its underlying model. SCE lists the additional information it requires for complete assessment of the model, below:

- E3 should provide a document detailing values and equations for all tabs other than the “Main” tab included in its Excel spreadsheet;
- The current modeling documentation leaves unclear how E3 captured transmission losses—such losses should be included in the assessment of dispatch decisions and a description of the magnitude of such losses and how they were incorporated would be helpful to analysis of the model;

- E3 should document its methodology for retiring generation resources (called “Generation Subtractions”) and the resources subtracted. Without such documentation it is unclear if E3’s model replaces generic generation with renewables or if it is modeling actual retirements of existing generation;
- E3 should document its assumed emission rate values for each fuel type. As the primary output of the GHG model is total emissions, it is vital that stakeholders be able to review E3’s assumptions for calculating total emissions. Accordingly, the emission rates used in PLEXOS should be discussed and disclosed in a table as part of Attachment B or in a similar location;
- As the E3 report is being disseminated via the internet, it would be helpful to have web links provided for all E3 referenced documents that are accessible via the internet;
- As reflected in the “Source of Simulation Data for 2008” chapter, some Seams Steering Group – Western Interconnect (“SSG-WI”) data has been modified by PS (e.g., existing and future resources) and some data is internal to PS (e.g., natural gas burner-tip prices).⁶ It would be appropriate to more clearly identify “PS” and the referenced modifications to the SSG-WI database; and
- While E3 is charged with evaluating the respective potential impacts of AB 32 compliance on both the electric and natural gas sectors, most if not all discussions to date have been associated with the electric sector. By what means, assumptions, and schedule will E3 perform an analysis of the natural gas sector?

⁶ See “CPUC GHG Modeling 2008 PLEXOS Data Sources” at Table titled “Source of Simulation Date for 2008.”

Question 7. Provide feedback, as desired or appropriate, on the structure and approach taken by E3 in its GHG Calculator spreadsheet tool.

SCE has two primary concerns regarding the approach taken by E3 in the GHG Calculator spreadsheet tool. First, the GHG Calculator does not consider load growth from electrification of other sectors. As individual sectors evaluate ways to reduce GHG emissions, it is becoming evident that many sectors will rely on electrification for their emissions reductions. Large-scale electrification will have a dramatic impact on electric load. While SCE supports electrification as a viable means of achieving significant emissions reductions, its impact on the electric sector should be fully explored by E3. In its modeling, E3 should include an assessment of the effect of electrification on California's emissions reductions. Specifically, the effects of electrification can be modeled by adjusting load forecasts to include the increased electrical demand resulting from sectors switching from fossil fuel to electricity.

Second, E3's GHG Calculator seems to have been formulated from the perspective that a load-based cap and trade system will be adopted in California. Because it is impossible to trace all loads to generation under a load-based approach, accurate emissions data for approximately 40% of California's power is missing from E3's model. Instead, E3 has substituted the emissions rate of a generic power pool to those resources. The assumption that 40% of California's power is appropriately represented by looking to a generic power pool is significantly flawed and will distort E3's model results, especially the result of any analyses on an LSE level. Accordingly, E3's assumptions and ensuing model results will be best suited for a statewide level analysis.

Question 8. Provide feedback, as desired or appropriate, on the data sources used by E3 for its assumptions in its issue papers. If you prefer different assumptions or sources, provide appropriate citations and explain the reason for your preference.

E3's methodology for retiring generation resources (called "Generation Subtractions") is not thoroughly described. Without such documentation it is unclear if E3's model replaces generic generation with renewables or if it is modeling actual retirements of existing generation.

Question 9. Are uncertainties inherent in the resource potential and cost estimates adequately identified? Does E3's model provide enough flexibility to test alternative assumptions with respect to these uncertainties?

No, the uncertainties inherent in the resource potential and cost estimates are not adequately identified. There are three specific input sensitivities that the GHG Calculator needs to consider further. Each of these encompasses a great degree of uncertainty and has the potential to significantly alter the output of the GHG Calculator.

First, E3's model must make provisions for inclusion of uncertainties associated with capital costs for generation and transmission. Simply trying to select a single, best estimate for a capital cost value is impossible given the current construction climate. Accordingly, E3 should employ a range of values (e.g., high, medium, and low case) in order to determine the possible range of outcomes for this variable.

Second, the status of tax credits for renewables is questionable. Some tax credits are set to sunset, while others may be instituted in the future. To account for these uncertainties, the model should evaluate the entire range of possible scenarios for tax credits.

Finally, E3's current model designates wind power as the preferred resource based on TRC. This designation does not reflect that the cost margin between wind and solar power is narrow. The gap is so narrow that in a few years technological developments could lower the cost of solar resources resulting in the two technologies switching places in the cost rankings. Since wind and solar powered generators have very different operating characteristics, the model

should also be run with solar power as the preferred resource. Incorporating such changes will allow the State to evaluate a near future where solar power is the preferred resource.

Question 10. Has the E3 model adequately accounted for the implications of increased reliance on preferred resources (renewables, efficiency) on system costs?

No, the GHG Calculator does not account for scarce supply of renewable resources. As more unions/countries/states take action to reduce GHG emissions, the demand for clean resources will increase. This increase in demand, combined with the current shortage of concrete, steel, building supplies and qualified contractors, as well as a backlog of supply for wind turbines, will likely lead to a scarcity of renewable resources and higher prices for those in existence. The E3 Calculator does not currently recognize this effect of increased demand for renewables. It can do so by factoring the supply crunch into its Renewable Supply Curves. As currently calculated, E3's wind supply curves show 400,000 GWh of wind energy available at a busbar cost of \$60/MWh or less. This implies over 160,000 MW of wind power can be installed at that cost or less before 2020. In reality, only a fraction of that capacity can be installed before 2020 at that price. E3's documentation should be modified to reflect a more realistic supply curve that accounts for wind turbine manufacturing capabilities.

Question 11. Should E3's model, in Stage 2, attempt to model potential market transformation scenarios, in the form of cost decreases, new technologies, or behavioral changes? What might be an appropriate way to characterize such potential for market transformation?

During Stage 2, E3 should evaluate the operational impacts of wind power's high penetration rates. The European experience has already demonstrated that high levels of wind resources within a system create unique operational challenges. While E3 has done a good job of capturing integration and firming costs for wind power, it is notable that the least-cost

dispatch of PLEXOS does not account for the intermittency of wind. In order to accurately evaluate any market transformation, E3 should include all relevant factors, including resource intermittency.

Question 12. What specific flexible GHG emission reduction mechanisms to mitigate the economic impacts of achieving the desired GHG emission reductions should be modeled in Stage 2?

SCE has no comment on this question at this time.

Question 13. What output metric or metrics should be utilized to evaluate the least cost way to meet a 2020 emission reduction target for the sector?

The \$/mton CO₂e metric should be utilized in both the E3 and Energy 2020 models, as required by AB 32.⁸ Using this consistent metric will allow comparison of the results of both models.

Emission reduction programs for all sectors should be evaluated using the dollar per ton of GHG emission reduced (typical units are \$/mton CO₂e) metric. This is a fungible metric for evaluating varied emission reduction measures across all sectors. It is commonly used by industry and international organizations. Using this common metric will allow the results of E3's model to be compared to the output of the Energy 2020 model, which will be used for other sectors.

In addition to using a similar metric when comparing the results of these two models, it is important to note that the cost of the emission reductions must be disaggregated from the cost of power in the electricity sector.

Continued from the previous page

⁷ See "CPUC Greenhouse Gas Modeling Renewable Supply Curves."

⁸ See Cal. Health and Safety §§38505(d), 38560.

III.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SECTIONS OF APPENDIX B

A. Comments on Modeling Methodology for Reference Case and Target Cases

1. 2008 PLEXOS Data Sources

While generally acceptable, E3's use of PLEXOS data raises two issues for SCE. First, E3's model uses WECC data for PLEXOS. That data is based upon SSG-WI data. SCE has experience with the SSG-WI data and has concluded that it requires several layers of review in order to be considered accurate. Although E3 acknowledges that the WECC database is new and will likely require revision, it may not be the most accurate warehouse for information. A more accurate alternative might be achieved with the purchase of a different database. Second, the documentation provided by E3 does not include a discussion of how transmission ratings and nomograms are incorporated. Without such documentation, it is unclear how nomograms such as the Southern California Import Transmission Nomogram ("SCIT") are incorporated, whether nomograms are honored, and whether transmission ratings are honored in E3's modeling.

2. Assigning Generation to LSEs

The following comments are based upon the information provided in E3's "Template for Party Information on Generators" spreadsheet, as posted on E3's website. SCE's review was specific to units assigned to SCE for year 2008 and year 2020.

SCE recognizes the challenge placed upon E3 in developing a database that reflects the operational and ownership characteristics of the generation facilities located in the WECC, especially given the confidentiality associated with many of the power purchase contracts involving merchant power plants, utilities, and energy service providers.

SCE has reviewed the database and at this time offers no specific changes to the assumptions regarding generation assignments made by E3. SCE's review of the generation

assignments indicates that E3 is assuming that the majority of the assignments in year 2008 continue into 2020. SCE comments that this assumption is very broad based, e.g. most of contracted transactions effective in year 2008 are probably not extended thru 2020. As such, SCE believes that the existing assumptions, as a whole, are best left as is and that making changes that reflect only SCE's perception are inappropriate.

3. Ensuring Sufficient Resources to Meet Loads

E3's documentation provides no information about retirement of generation resources. This failure to retire resources results in a WECC end-state that contemplates a 16,000 MW surplus in 2020.⁹ Such a planning scenario is not consistent with the planning scenarios being used by most entities which comprise the WECC.

If in fact a 16,000 MW surplus existed, many resources would likely be retired. Such retirement of resources would change the mix of resources being assessed and would likely lead to system operability issues (since the addition of intermittent wind resources would require greater ramping capability).

Second, E3 states, "Pumping load is assumed to drop to zero during system peaks."¹⁰ This assumption is incorrect. Not all pumping loads can be reduced to zero at the time of the peak load. A more realistic assumption would be to assume that pumping load drops by 50%.

Third, E3's resource calculations seem to assume that California is the only state that will be using Demand Response programs in the future.¹¹ Instead of assuming zero Demand Response for other states, E3 should include an estimate for other states' programs if they are cost-effective.

⁹ "CPUC GHG Modeling – Ensuring Sufficient Resources to Meet Loads," at 3 (Table 5).

¹⁰ "CPUC GHG Modeling – Ensuring Sufficient Resources to Meet Loads," at 3 (Table 5).

¹¹ *Id.* at 4 (Table 5).

Fourth, in Table 4, E3 seems to conclude that the Pacific Northwest (including Utah) region is the only area adding any significant amount of combined cycle generating turbine (“CCGT”) technology. Without justification this assumption does not make business sense. If E3 cannot justify its assumptions with regard to such resources, the resource calculation should be modified.

Lastly, E3’s analysis assumes coincidence of peak loads throughout the WECC. This assumption is wrong. As the CPUC and parties to this proceeding are aware, WECC non-coincidence has and continues to be a major contributor to the ability of states to share resources for capacity purposes throughout the WECC. Accordingly, E3 should revise its assumptions regarding coincidence of peak load throughout the WECC.

B. Comments on Inputs to E3 Base Case and Target Cases

1. Comments on General Input Assumptions

a) Reference Case Policy Assumptions

The reference case recommends demand response assumptions of five percent of peak demand for IOUs and none for others.¹² This assumption must be revised. If demand response is cost-effective for IOUs, it should also be cost-effective for POUs. An assumption that does not capture the full effects of all entities using demand response to reduce emissions inherently fails to comply with the mandates of AB 32.

Additionally, the reference case recommends LSE load forecasts that are an extrapolation of CEC information out to 2020. These forecasts are not accurate. The CEC forecast contains errors in its assumptions regarding the amount of available energy efficiency. In addition, the amount of energy efficiency assumed by the CEC is inconsistent with that used

¹² “CPUC GHG Modeling 2020 Reference Case Input Assumptions,” at 2.

by other WECC entities and therefore biases the forecast to be significantly too low when compared to the other areas.

b) **Financing and Tax Incentive Assumptions for New Resources**

(1) **Financing Assumptions**

Upon review, although calculation of generation costs on a single spreadsheet instead of using a full generation cost model for each asset type may lead to some margin of error, the generation cost calculation in the model seems to provide a fair approximation of costs. A few of the simplifying assumptions that would contribute to a margin of error include the setting of the book life at a term equal to contract life – if actual asset life is not equal to the book life assumed in the model (i.e., 20 years for independent power producer and 30 years for IOUs and municipal utilities), the model may overstate costs of longer life assets and understate costs of shorter life assets; and the exclusion of preferred stock in financing assumptions – California utilities have preferred stock as a component of their capital structure. A more accurate financing assumption would include preferred stock in lieu of the 50/50 debt to equity assumption.

(2) **Tax Incentive Assumptions**

The E3 model contains assumptions that are generally a good representation of the tax incentives and credits available under Federal and California tax law. The following nuances should be considered when actual identified projects are modeled:

- Tax rates used assume all projects are located in California. The tax rates could be different if projects are located in other states;
- Taxpayer could also be eligible for the Section 199 Manufacturer's Deduction which would provide additional benefits;

- California does not conform to the federal accelerated depreciation method (“ACRS/MACRS”). However, the California asset lives could be different from the book asset lives;
- Deferred taxes should be considered as applicable; and
- Some of these credits and incentives have sunset dates before 2020.¹³

c) **Fuel Price Forecasts for the WECC**

SCE has reviewed the fuel price forecast used by E3 in its PLEXOS production cost model. Since E3’s analysis involves always treating natural gas units as the marginal units, relative to generators being displaced to reduce green house gas emissions, SCE’s review was focused on natural gas prices.

SCE accepts E3’s use of \$8.79/MMBtu (2020 nominal dollars) as a reasonable price of natural gas delivered to a generator in California in the year 2020. SCE also accepts as reasonable E3’s assumptions regarding rationing fuel prices within the SSG-WI data base as a method of maintaining relative price differences between WECC regions.

Similar to an earlier comment regarding how changes to technology may cause solar to become more economic than wind as a renewable resource, technology advancements in fossil-fueled generation may also result in a change in the economic dispatch order and resulting GHG emission values.

d) **Assumptions Regarding 2020 RPS Requirements in the WECC**

Overall, the information collected by E3 regarding the RPS in various areas within the WECC is accurate and the assumptions made are reasonable. SCE notes four areas related to the 2020 RPS that should be added in order to make the model’s analysis more

¹³ Additional comments to the tax section of the E3 presentation are attached hereto as Appendix A.

complete. Each of these suggestions pertains to assumptions regarding the types of generation that can be imported from one region to another.

The types of generation classified as renewable by E3 are not homogeneous across all states within the WECC. For example, Oregon allows hydroelectric power up to an average of 50 MW per year, while California caps the size of eligible hydroelectric power at 30 MW. If this constraint were added to the E3 model, it would not allow hydroelectric power greater than 30 MW, which is eligible for the Oregon renewable standard, to meet California's renewable standard. Accordingly, E3 should include a constraint on the size of eligible hydroelectric power in its assessment of the 2020 RPS requirements.

The E3 models should address California's requirement that in-state renewable generation be scheduled into the state is not addressed.¹⁴ This requirement could affect the amount of imports available for transmission from one area to another for purposes of meeting a renewable standard. E3's documentation leaves unclear whether this issue was addressed. Including assumptions related to this constraint will yield a more accurate picture of the amount of renewables that will be available within and outside of California.

E3's assumptions about the renewables standard do not reflect the reality of penalties and alternative compliance payments and how those impact the export strategies of generators and LSEs in various areas. The current E3 assumption is that California can only import renewable energy from other WECC regions to the extent that the available renewable power in that region is in excess of the region's own consumption. E3 should consider layering on an additional economic filter to account for the opportunity cost of a generator or LSE meeting its state's renewables standard. In theory, if a generator can sell its renewable energy for more than its state's penalty or alternative compliance payment, from an economic perspective, the generator or LSE may be willing to sell its generation out-of-state in lieu of using the generation to satisfy the in-state renewable target.

¹⁴ Renewables Portfolio Standard Guidebook, Draft Guidebook, December 2007, at 29.

E3 assumes that the entire state of California will reach 20% by 2020 based on the various goals established by municipal utilities. While SCE understands the reasoning behind this assumption, it is important to note that municipal utilities are not regulated by the CPUC and, therefore, may not have the same incentives to reach their goals as regulated entities. Accordingly, E3 should consider reducing the “20% by 2020” assumption.

2. Comments on Load Forecast Assumptions

a) CA LSE and WECC Load and Energy Forecasts

The demand forecast referenced in E3’s modeling documentation as the basis for creating the resource expansion plan is the CEC’s California Energy Demand 2008 - 2018 Staff Revised Forecast.¹⁵ E3’s documentation seems to have mistakenly reported the CEC data. For 2008 and as extrapolated for 2020 the Peak Demand and Energy numbers do not match. The numbers from the CEC forecast are significantly higher than E3’s reported numbers. To the extent E3 purports to rely on CEC data, it should revise its numbers to reflect what the CEC reported. The error and corrected values are set forth below.

E3 Model Documentation Values for SCE			CEC Forecast Values for SCE		
	Peak Demand (MW)	Energy (GWh)		Peak Demand (MW)	Energy (GWh)
2008	21,476	87,532	2008	23,272	105,054
2020	25,777	106,018	2016	26,382	118,497

3. Comments on Demand-Side Resources and Costs Assumptions

a) CSI Forecast

E3’s CSI assumptions are very aggressive and should be revised. In its documentation, E3 identifies 1,091 MW of solar resources in the business-as-usual reference

¹⁵ “CPUC GHG Modeling CA LSE and WECC Load and Energy Forecasts,” at 1.

case by 2020, 3,000 MW of solar for the aggressive reference and target cases by 2020, and \$8/W used for cost. While it may be possible to install 1,091 MW of solar power by 2020, vast market transformation will be required to install 3,000 MW of solar power by 2020. Rather than choose a realistic aggressive target, E3 has chosen a target that is basically infeasible. The aggressive target should be revised downward to reflect what could be considered an aggressive amount, under current market conditions. In addition to overly aggressive reference and target cases, E3's CSI forecasts are flawed because they use an \$8/W cost figure. A more accurate cost range is \$9 to \$10/W.

In addition to the overly aggressive assumptions described above, E3's assessment of the value to be derived from solar power appears to be inconsistent. While all of the MWs assigned in both the reference cases are credited only to IOUs, the 3,000 MW goal includes the IOU version of CSI (\$2.1 billion), the CEC New Solar Homes Partnership (\$400 million), and the Municipal Utilities CSI programs (\$700 million). With this budget in mind, the assigned value of 1,376 MW for SCE is too high.¹⁶

b) Demand Response Forecast

The demand response forecast used by E3 is consistent with the current goal of five percent of system peak. Nevertheless, it is unrealistic to expect that this goal will be met. Currently, demand response goals are under review in a proceeding at the CPUC. If the CPUC alters the goals, E3 should modify its model accordingly. In the interim, the demand response goals approved by the CPUC for each IOU, through the Long-Term Procurement Plans ("LTTPs"), should be utilized.

4. Comments on New Generation Resources and Costs

For each of the resources assessed in the E3 model, assumed design, procurement, construction, and start-up costs are low. SCE's recent discussions with original equipment

¹⁶ Similarly, the values for other IOUs may be too high.

manufacturers (e.g., combustion turbine generators, steam turbine generators, wind turbines), Engineering, Procurement & Construction (“EPC”) companies, and other engineering companies indicate that costs for raw materials (e.g., steel, copper), manufactured goods (e.g., structural steel, concrete, copper wire, combustion turbines, steam turbines, heat recovery generator, boilers), construction manpower/labor, design engineers are rapidly increasing. Accordingly, while E3’s cost assumptions can be used to conduct a comparison of the relative costs to construct various types of new generation resources, E3’s cost assumptions should not be used for definitive cost estimation of the cost of energy (“COE”). If a definitive COE is required, an updated, definitive cost for a specific resource in a specific area with site specific criteria should be developed.

a) **Wind Resources, Cost, and Performance**

E3’s documentation overstates the amount of commercially viable wind resources. Specifically, E3 includes Class 3 wind sites within California. Such sites should not be included in the model.

Class 3 wind sites should not be included in the resource estimates because the industry does not generally consider them economically viable. E3 itself seems to recognize the limitation on such resources for wind resources outside of California as its model does not include Class 3 or Class 4 wind sites found outside of California.

Additionally, E3’s model assumes that a current, mainstream wind turbine to be rated at 2.5 MW.¹⁷ While recent installations of up to 3.0 MW have started within the past year, 1.5 MW is the most common size. If E3 does not wish to revise its model in this fashion, it could incorporate size options for wind turbines. This feature would allow for the true state of wind technology to be reflected in model results, rather than reflecting an overly simplistic and optimistic scenario.

¹⁷ “CPUC GHG Modeling New Wind Generation – Resource, Cost, and Performance Assumptions,” at 1.

Lastly, the model should allow for adjustments to the filter percentages in the Environmental Exclusions.¹⁸ Currently, E3's assessment only excludes 50% of Department of Defense lands. However, based on a rudimentary survey of areas within SCE's service area, it is clear that other factors preclude the use of Department of Defense lands (i.e., flight patterns and potential interference with radar related to military operations).

b) Biomass Resources, Cost, and Performance

E3 should verify the heat rate assumptions it has chosen for the base cost of biomass and biogas projects.¹⁹ The heat rate E3 has assumed for biomass seems extremely low and the heat rate it has chosen for biogas seems extremely high. Because heat rates depend on the on prime mover technology to generate electricity from biomass or biogas, the model should incorporate different selections based on the prime mover technology.

Additionally, the E3 model includes a value of 600 MW potential assumed for biomass based on the assumption that no municipal solid waste ("MSW") gasification will be developed. This assumption is contrary to previous CEC findings. According to the "CEC Draft Report on Biomass," the technical potential of biomass statewide is estimated to be close to 4,700 MWe.²⁰

c) Geothermal Resources, Cost, and Performance

The cost of expanding an existing facility within a known and proven resource area is significantly lower than the cost of developing a new, remote resource area such as south central Nevada or eastern California. E3's model does not recognize this business

¹⁸ *Id.* at 72

¹⁹ "CPUC GHG Modeling New Biomass and Biogas Generation – Resource, Cost, and Performance Assumptions," at 3-4.

²⁰ "CEC Biomass Resource Assessment in California, Draft Report," April 2005.

reality for geothermal resources. In order to accurately model such resources, E3 should revise its model that includes multiple geothermal plant selections.²¹

Additionally, SCE disagrees with the assumption that no fossil fuel is used at geothermal facilities. Geyser facilities fire natural gas as part of the hydrogen sulfide abatement process while other geothermal plants use propane. Some geothermal plants use hydrocarbon working fluids that can leak into the atmosphere. Rather than assign an emissions rate of zero to all geothermal facilities, E3 should assign GHG emissions rates by reference to the particular plant technology. SCE suggests the following categories of geothermal resources:

- binary plants that have zero GHG emissions from the wells, but VOC emissions from the generation process;
- flash plants that have high fugitive GHG emissions from high GHG potential wells;
- flash plants that have low fugitive emissions; and direct steam plants such as Geysers.

d) **Concentrating Solar Power Resources, Cost, and Performance**

E3's documentation does not seem to take into account that newer hybrid solar plants seeking permits today incorporate CCGTs with concentrated solar thermal (as opposed to a gas fired-boiler and a solar-powered boiler).²² Such new hybrid plants produce a majority of their energy from the non-renewable source. The E3 report does not currently recognize this difference and should to more accurately capture the full extent of emissions from concentrating solar power technologies.

²¹ E3 has done this for multiple fossil fired selections. See "CPUC GHG Modeling New Geothermal Generation – Resource, Cost, and Performance Assumptions," at 2.

²² <http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/index.html> Energy Facilities Siting/Licensing Process.

E3's reference case utilizes six hours of thermal storage as an assumption for concentrated solar power.²³ This assumption does not accurately represent the actual operations of plants within the State. To more accurately capture how plants operate, SCE recommends making storage a variable in the model and creating an option for inserting a Concentrated Solar Plant ("CSP") without storage and/or adjust the hours of storage. To this end, E3 should revise Tables A and B in this section to include multiple types of CSP (i.e., with and without storage) and corresponding capacity factors. SCE also suggests that separate cost numbers be provided, one linked to the increased cost of the solar field to support storage and another linked to the storage cost itself. Such factors are included to some extent in the 2006 Black & Veatch study as well as the Sargent & Lundy forecast already cited by E3.²⁴

Finally, E3's model ignores the viable option of installing small-scale distributed solar on warehouse rooftops, commercial buildings, or multi-family housing developments. It does so by assuming that urban areas cannot support such solar power.²⁵ E3 should revise its model to reflect the uses of solar power in urban areas.

5. Comments on All-in Resource Costs By Zone

a) Renewable Energy Supply Curves

See response to question no. 10 above.

b) Transmission Costs

Generally, the transmission cost assumptions and estimates utilized by E3 appear reasonable, but certain components of E3's assessment require revision or modification. These components are set forth below.

²³ "CPUC GHG Modeling New Concentrating Solar power (CSP) Generation – Resource, Cost, and Performance Assumptions," at 1.

²⁴ See *id.* at 5-6.

²⁵ *Id.* at 2.

(1) **E3 Appears to Have Reasonably Estimated Transmission Cost Components**

E3 appears to have reasonably estimated major transmission cost components such as right-of-way, transmission lines, transmission substations, and voltage support infrastructure.²⁶ However, E3 should review certain figures for accuracy.

For example, Table 4-3 in this section seems to have incorrectly reported 500 kV Line Termination (substation) costs to be \$26 million. This table was extracted from the CEC 2007 IEPR, which in turn relied upon cost estimates from the Frontier Line study group. Frontier estimates for 500 kV substations should be around \$50 million for a single substation, therefore the estimated \$26 million may be low.²⁷

Additionally, Table 1 utilizes a \$1600/MW-mile metric to estimate resource interconnection costs. The report labels this metric as a rule of thumb. It would be helpful if some additional information justifying this metric were disclosed. Similarly, reporting the sources used to derive the estimated “levelized interconnection costs for conventional resources” reported on page 137 would create a more complete report.

Lastly, SCE suggests that E3 disclose system upgrade costs, which are not included in the current transmission cost methodology.²⁸

(2) **E3’s Cost Methodology Appears Reasonable**

The cost methodology used in E3’s GHG Model also appears to be reasonable. The methodology is reasonable because, among other things, it attempts to quantify changes in delivery costs between resource locations. Intuitively, delivery costs increase as the

²⁶ Due to the mix of cost references relied upon, there may be some inconsistency of costs between references such as right-of-way costs, but such differences are not considered too important in this type of screening analysis.

²⁷ Frontier study group estimated the following: \$50 million per 500 kV AC substation (equipment will include the following: (a) three 500/230/345 kV transformers – 3 * \$8 M = \$24 M; (b) one set of shunt reactors - \$10 M; and (c) Terminal Equipment \$16 M.

²⁸ System upgrade costs that can be significant, but are normally omitted in screening analyses since they require lengthy technical studies to estimate.

distance between the location of resources and the load they serve increase. The GHG Model captures this relationship using a delivery costs per mile metric.²⁹ There are however a couple of controversial assumptions in that assessment.

First, E3 notes that new conventional generation like nuclear and coal resources will be located within 25 miles of a backbone transmission system. While this may be true, how one uses that assumption in estimating delivery costs is important. A new nuclear or clean coal generator would be dispatched as a baseload resource due to its size and technology. Large new base load generation resources will require new dedicated transmission lines because of insufficient capacity in existing lines. As a result, even if new conventional resources are located near a backbone transmission grid, it is unlikely that existing transmission capacity could accommodate such new resources. Accordingly, it would be helpful if the report described delivery cost implications of assuming nuclear and coal resources will be located within 25 miles of a backbone transmission system. For example, is it assumed that existing grid facilities located 25 miles away have capacity to integrate new generation? If so, this assumption should be disclosed. Additionally, E3 should consider including system upgrade cost estimate for new large resources in its analysis as these costs normally increase with the size of generation installation.

Second, E3 states it has utilized the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (“NREL”) transmission assignment method that assumes 10% of total transmission capacity for each line is available for transmission of new wind resources.³⁰ This is not a reasonable assumption because it assumes no congestion on all lines. As E3’s analysis attempts to estimate the effect of integrating large quantities of resources, transmission congestion should be considered.

²⁹ Delivery costs here include major transmission cost components, but not all costs. For instance, system upgrades, annual losses, operating and maintenance, telecommunications, transmission service fees, etc., were not estimated, but are generally not significant in a screening analysis. One exception is system upgrade costs which can be significant, but are normally omitted from screening analyses since their estimation requires lengthy technical study.

³⁰ “CPUC GHG Modeling Transmission Cost Assumptions,” at 5.

Third, another area that is left vague by E3's analysis is the scaling used when estimating future transmission line costs. E3 tabulates point-to-point transmission costs by scaling costs using 250 MW and 500 MW increments.³¹ Transmission projects do not typically increase in 250 MW increments. E3 seems to recognize this for some projects when it increases them in 1,500 MW steps, but others are inexplicably increased in 250 MW increments.

c) **Wind Integration Costs**

With regard to wind integration costs, E3 states, "To account for this, we assume that all wind will be integrated into the largest control area in the region."³² This assumption may lead to incorrect assessment of wind integration costs. It may do so because it fails to acknowledge that smaller areas may have greater difficulty integrating intermittent wind energy than larger areas. Larger areas may have more resources capable of meeting ramping or other operational needs than smaller areas.

Additionally, E3 conducted a regression analysis on 32 data estimates of integration costs for wind resource penetration between five percent and 30 percent of total system generation capacity, which were included in ten publicly available studies for North American utilities. Generally, this is an appropriate method to estimate wind integration costs at varying penetration levels. However, E3's study describes a series of hypothetical scenarios that seem inconsistent. Although SCE agrees with the conclusions E3 makes regarding integration costs, the lack of consistency in its modeling will detract from these conclusions. Accordingly, SCE recommends revising the evaluation to use the following assumptions for a 50,000 MW Control Area:

³¹ Some of the transmission cost estimates used by E3 are less lumpy. For instance, a line from WY appears to have reasonable lumpiness in 1,500 MW increments. Other lines, like from San Diego are lumpy in 250 MW increments initially, then 1,500 MW later as transmission capacity is increased. This lumpiness may be reasonable if based upon transmission upgrades having such lumpiness.

³² "CPUC GHG Modeling Cost of Integrating Wind Resources," at 3.

- 10% Penetration = 5,000 MW Wind → 15,000 GWh (34%cf)
@\$3.13/MWh = \$47 million
- 20% Penetration = 10,000 MW Wind → 30,000 GWh (34%cf)
@\$6.26/MWh = \$188 million
- 30% Penetration = 15,000 MW Wind → 45,000 GWh (34%cf)
@\$9.39/MWh = \$423 million

d) **Firming Costs**

Although E3's values for firming penalties seem reasonable, E3 should include a non-thermal solar resource in this table with a corresponding firming penalty. As currently documented, E3's Table 1 only includes a solar thermal resources. As E3 recognizes that "intermittent resources such as wind and solar energy are not always available to produce energy during system peaks," a non-thermal solar resource in this table with a corresponding firming penalty would be appropriate.

e) **Resource Ranking and Selection**

SCE has identified the following errors in E3's analysis of resource ranking and selection:

- Table CA-3 appears to contain a typographical error. The regional multiplier for the other states should not be 1.20 for all states;
- While E3's delivered energy prices are reasonable, a sensitivity analysis should be conducted to determine if price changes by plus or minus 10 – 20% in any specific technology would drastically change the conclusions; and
- When using its data to determine the lowest cost resource, E3 appears to utilize the total delivered cost as the primary basis for resource selection. If too much baseload generation (e.g., geothermal) is added, then lack of dispatchability and surplus

generation in evening hours becomes an issue that must be assessed. Neither the E3 nor the PLEXOS model seems to accurately measure the effect of such resource decisions.

f) **California Resource Zones**

E3 estimates that California has a total of 53,044 MW of wind generation resource potential; 3,008 MW of geothermal potential; 221 MW of RPS-eligible small hydro potential; 89,650 MW of CSP potential; 300 MW of total biogas potential; and 600 MW of total biomass. E3 arrives at these estimates based on public reports from NREL, the CEC, and other sources. These estimates are grouped into approximately 30 zones in and around California. While these zones and the estimated resources seem reasonable, E3 leaves unclear whether the resource potential in these zones is incremental to what is installed and operating today, or if it represents the total potential including those resources installed and operating. Stakeholders would benefit from further description of the intent behind E3's tables/zones.

6. **Comments on Reference Case and Target Case Results**

a) **Aggressive Policy Results**

SCE has forecasted that its 2008 CO₂ emissions will be around 26 million tons. The results shown in both the Business-as-Usual and Aggressive Policy papers indicate that SCE's 2008 CO₂ emissions total about 30.5 million tons of CO₂. This 13% difference is significant and indicates a likelihood that lack of complete generation and contract data for each LSE is resulting in calculated values that may have large margins of error.

7. **Comments on Model Benchmarking**

a) **Electricity Sector Emissions Benchmarks**

E3 should utilize the California Air Resources Board's ("CARB's") most recent GHG emission inventory to ensure consistency with statewide efforts. Accordingly, E3 should use the 1990 Baseline inventory recently approved by CARB.

8. **Comments on GHG Calculator**

E3 states that it will benchmark GHG Calculator results with production simulations. E3 should document its proposed benchmarking methodology and state the timing for such benchmarking. It is critical that stakeholders be allowed to review E3's proposed methodology as it may justify the use of a spreadsheet rather than a production simulation. As this benchmark will likely be used to develop California's GHG policy, it is critical that the benchmarking evaluation be conducted with the greatest level of accuracy.

a) **Brief Calculator Description**

The description that was last updated November 7, 2007 on the E3 website provides a good, high-level view of the calculator and its intended functions and purpose. The description sufficiently summarizes what is seen on the "Main" tab of E3's GHG calculator. However, as SCE has noted above, it would be helpful for stakeholders to have access to a document, which captures details on values and equations listed on tabs other than the "Main" tab.

IV.

OTHER

A. Party Information on Generators

The following comments and concerns exemplify why E3's data assumptions³³ and modeling approach will provide results that are appropriate for a statewide analysis of the impacts of GHG in the electric sector. They will also explain why such an approach is not appropriate on an LSE basis.

CO₂ Rate Assumptions. The emission rates (lb/mmBTU) used by E3 appear to be the same for each respective fuel type. That is, all coal units have an assigned 208 lb/mmBtu emission rate and all natural gas units have an assigned 117 lb/mmBtu emission rate. This assumption may result in inaccurate GHG emissions levels, especially for those emissions from combined cycle units burning natural gas.

E3 is assuming that a generation facilities within California is either owned (in part of in full) by one of the five largest electric utilities (i.e., Pacific Gas and Electric ("PG&E"), SCE, San Diego Gas & Electric ("SDG&E"), Sacramento Municipal Utility District ("SMUD"), Los Angeles Department of Water and Power ("LADWP")), by a utility that is grouped within a respective "Northern Other" and "Southern Other" utility, or that it a generation facility can be classified as "ownership unspecified" and allocated to a "Northern CA Powerpool" or "Southern CA Powerpool." This assumption is intuitively appropriate for a production cost model that will evaluate results on a statewide basis.

E3 is planning to analyze GHG scenarios on both a statewide and LSE level. However, E3's modeling assumptions reflect specific information pertaining to the five largest electric service providers in California, which are also LSEs, but reflect at best minimal information pertaining to the other LSEs operating within California. Calculating a GHG impact for some,

³³ Based on information in E3's "Template for Party Information on Generators" spreadsheet.

but not all individual LSEs will provide inaccurate information and may lead to decisions that are inaccurate and more costly to implement.

V.

CONCLUSION

SCE appreciates the opportunity to comment on E3's documentation and urges E3 to incorporate the suggestions contained herein.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL D. MONTOYA
LAURA I. GENAO
CATHY KARLSTAD

/S/ LAURA I. GENAO

By: Laura I. Genao

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-6842
Facsimile: (626) 302-1935
E-mail: laura.genao@scc.com

January 7, 2008

Appendix A

Taxes and Tax Incentives

For all types of ownership, income taxes are based on the levelized equity return, and are adjusted for any available tax incentives. The model assumes a 35% federal tax rate and an 8.84% state tax rate, resulting in a 40.7% marginal tax rate.³⁴ Taxable income is calculated using book depreciation, adjusted for any accelerated tax depreciation³⁵ and full tax benefit of interest. The model currently assumes no state-level accelerated depreciation tax benefits, as is the current case in California.³⁶ Any production or investment tax credits are applied, and taxes are grossed up such that the owner achieves its target after-tax return on equity.³⁷ Taxes are levelized over the appropriate ownership term, then divided by the plant capacity to achieve a 2008 levelized \$/kW charge. Property taxes are assumed to be 1% of the total project capital costs, and property tax amounts are also levelized.

Tax and Policy Incentives

Many of the generating technologies in the GHG calculator are eligible for a variety of tax breaks and other incentives from either the federal or state government. Currently available federal government tax benefits include investment tax credits (“ITC”); production tax credits (“PTC”), and accelerated depreciation. California state-level incentives include property-tax incentives and Supplemental Energy Payments. The model assumes that the state-level SEP and property tax incentives would no longer be available in 2020, nor would federal incentives with cumulative capacity limitations.

Other federal tax benefits are assumed to be permanently available at 2008 levels. Therefore, the current ITC is assumed to apply to geothermal and solar thermal assets in 2020, and the current production tax credit (“PTC”) is assumed to apply to biogas & biomass, large and small hydro, and wind projects. Table C below details current tax policy.³⁸

The calculator assumes that the investment tax credit will continue to be available only if a project is under independent power producer (“IPP”) ownership, and that accelerated depreciation and PTC benefits would be available to both IOUs and IPPs. Because municipal utilities do not pay taxes, the cost of their projects is not impacted by tax benefits.

The ITC is applied to eligible project costs; therefore the calculator provides an input that allows users to reduce total capital costs by a multiplier to obtain the eligible project costs. In the base case, the model assumes that 75% of total project costs are ITC-eligible costs, and that the entire ITC is available in the first year. The term of the PTC is 10 years. The first year PTC amount is escalated by inflation over the 10-year term, then present-valued to 2008. Both ITC and PTC are also levelized in 2008 dollars.

³⁴ This state rate assumes projects located in California. If the project was located in another jurisdiction, the rate will in most cases be lower.

³⁵ The book-tax depreciation differences should be offset with full deferred tax. The benefit of accelerated depreciation is equal to the rate of return, multiplied by the deferred tax balance for each year.

³⁶ However, California tax lives are frequently different from book lives. CA taxable income is computed using the state lives with deferred taxes applied to any book-tax differences.

³⁷ In addition, the deduction under Section 199 may be available for these projects. These benefits are computed using the applicable rate (6% or 9%), subject to a limitation for wages paid.

³⁸ Certain credits have sunset dates before 2020.

Technology	Depreciable Life			Incentives	
	Federal		California	Federal	California
Coal IGCC (Integrated gasification combined cycle)	7YRS MACRS	7 YRS SL		20% ITCC (limited to first 4GW of new IGCC capacity)	NO CA incentive available
Coal IGCC with CCS	7YRS MACRS	7 YRS SL		20% ITCC (limited to first 4GW of new IGCC capacity)	NO CA incentive available
Coal ST (Advanced coal)	20 YRS MACRS	ADR-28 YRS 2000DB		15% of ITCC (limited to first 3GW of new capacity)	NO CA incentive available
Natural Gas Combined cycle combustion turbine (CCCT)				None	NO CA incentive available
Natural Gas CT				None	NO CA incentive available
Nuclear	15 YRS - MACRS	ADR-20YRS 2000DB		1.8c/kWh PTC for first 8 years by 2020	NO CA incentive available
BioGas & Biomass:					CA SEP eligible (see requirements)
- Closed loop biomass (organic plants raised specifically for fuel)	5 YRS - MACRS	5 YRS SL		1.9c/kWh PTC for first 10 years if in service by 2008	
- Open/landfill gas/municipal solid waste (agricultural livestock or vegetation waste)	5 YRS - MACRS	5 YRS SL		1.0c/kWh PTC for first 10 years if in service by 2008	
Geothermal	5 YRS - MACRS	5 YRS SL		1.9c/kWh PTC for first 10 years if in service by 2008	CA SEP eligible (see requirements)
				10% permanent production tax credit	
				Incremental addition at existing generator, or generation built at existing non-hydroelectric dam: 1.0c/kWh	
Large Hydro	20 YRS MACRS	ADR-50 YRS 2000DB		Production tax credit for first 10 years if in service by 2008	NO CA incentive available
				Incremental addition at existing generator, or generation built at existing non-hydroelectric dam: 1.0c/kWh	
Small Hydro	20 YRS MACRS	ADR-50 YRS 2000DB		Production tax credit for first 10 years if in service by 2008	CA SEP eligible (see requirements)
Solar Thermal	5 YRS - MACRS	5 YRS SL		30% ITC if in service by 2008	AB 1451(Leno) - §73 Property tax exemption 1/1/2010
				10% permanent production tax credit	CA SEP eligible (see requirements)
Wind	5 YRS - MACRS	5 YRS SL		1.9c/kWh PTC for first 10 years if in service by 2008	CA SEP eligible (see requirements)

IRC §45(a)	<p>IRC §45 Electricity Produced from certain renewable resources</p> <p>IRC §45 is a component of the general business credit under IRC §38</p> <p>Credit rates and phaseout - For electricity produced in 2005, the amount of indexed credit is 1.9 cents per kilowatt-hour</p> <p>The credit is reduced (up to 50% of the allowed) for grants, tax-exempt bonds, subsidized energy financing, and other types of credits that may have been claimed with respect to the production facility</p>
IRC §45(b)(3)	<p>For periods after 12/31/2005, the business investment credit for solar energy property is 30% of the basis of qualified energy property placed in service in that year</p> <p>The basis of energy property that is financed by tax-exempt private activity bonds or subsidized energy financing must be reduced</p> <p>Energy property includes property that meets the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. must be solar property; 2. the construction, reconstruction, or erection of property must be completed by the taxpayer 3. the property must be depreciable or subject to amortization deductions 4. the property must meet quality and performance standards that are in effect at the time of acquisition. <p>The energy credit is not available for energy property that is owned by utility.</p> <p>The energy credit cannot be claimed for any property that is part of a facility that produces electricity for which the renewable electricity production credit is allowed (§45).</p>
IRC §48(a)(2)	
IRC §48(a)(4)	
IRC §48(a)(3)	
IRC §168(e)(3)(B)(vi)(I)(II)(III)	MACRS recovery period for solar energy properties
Rev Proc 87-56	Accelerated cost recovery class lives
CA Energy Commission	Renewable Portfolio Standard Eligibility Guideline (3/07)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, pursuant to the Commissioner's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have this day served a true copy of RESPONSE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING COMMENTS ON MODELING-RELATED ISSUES on all parties identified in the attached service list(s).

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 **7th day of January, 2008**, at Rosemead, California.

/S/ RAQUEL IPPOLITI

Raquel Ippoliti

Project Analyst

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Ave.

Post Office Box 800

Rosemead, California 91770

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

CINDY ADAMS
COVANTA ENERGY CORPORATION
40 LANE ROAD
FAIRFIELD, NJ 7004
R.06-04-009

DAN ADLER
DIRECTOR, TECH AND POLICY
DEVELOPMENT
CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY FUND
5 THIRD STREET, SUITE 1125
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
R.06-04-009

CASE ADMINISTRATION
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMead, CA 91770
R.06-04-009

FARROKH ALBUYEH
VICE PRESIDENT
OPEN ACCESS TECHNOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL INC
1875 SOUTH GRANT STREET
SAN MATEO, CA 94402
R.06-04-009

MICHAEL P. ALCANTAR
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

MAHLON ALDRIDGE
ECOLOGY ACTION
PO BOX 1188
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
R.06-04-009

KEN ALEX
1300 I STREET, SUITE 125
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244
R.06-04-009

CATHIE ALLEN
CA STATE MGR.
PACIFICORP
825 NE MULTNOMAH STREET, SUITE 2000
PORTLAND, OR 97232
R.06-04-009

PETER V. ALLEN
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN &
STEINER
101 SECOND STREET, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

SCOTT J. ANDERS
RESEARCH/ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO SCHOOL OF
LAW
5998 ALCALA PARK
SAN DIEGO, CA 92110
R.06-04-009

JASMIN ANSAR
PG&E
PO BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

JEANNE B. ARMSTRONG
ATTORNEY AT LAW
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY &
LAMPREY
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

JESUS ARREDONDO
DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AND
GOVERNMENTAL
NRG ENERGY, INC.
4600 CARLSBAD BLVD.
CARLSBAD, CA 92208
R.06-04-009

SAKIS ASTERIADIS
APX INC
1270 FIFTH AVE., SUITE 15R
NEW YORK, NY 10029
R.06-04-009

ELIZABETH BAKER
SUMMIT BLUE CONSULTING
1722 14TH STREET, SUITE 230
BOULDER, CO 80304
R.06-04-009

GARY BARCH
FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES, INC.
9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE
LOUISVILLE, KY 40223
R.06-04-009

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH
BARKOVICH & YAP, INC.
44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE
MENDOCINO, CA 95460
R.06-04-009

AIMEE BARNES
MANAGER REGULATORY AFFAIRS
ECOSECURITIES
206 W. BONITA AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CA 91711
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

CURT BARRY
717 K STREET, SUITE 503
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

KELLY BARR
MANAGER, REGULATORY AFFAIRS &
CONTRACTS
SALT RIVER PROJECT
PO BOX 52025, PAB 221
PHOENIX, AZ 85072-2025
R.06-04-009

OBADIAH BARTHOLOMY
MECHANICAL ENGINEER
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY
DISTRICT
6201 S. STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95817
R.06-04-009

PANAMA BARTHOLOMY
ADVISOR TO CHAIR PFANNENSTIEL
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

CARMEN E. BASKETTE
SENIOR MGR MARKET DEVELOPMENT
ENERNOC
594 HOWARD ST., SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

R. THOMAS BEACH
CROSSBORDER ENERGY
2560 NINTH STREET, SUITE 213A
BERKELEY, CA 94710-2557
R.06-04-009

SEAN P. BEATTY
ATTORNEY AT LAW
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP
201 CALIFORNIA ST., 17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

BUD BEEBE
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTIL DIST
6201 S STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95817-1899
R.06-04-009

C. SUSIE BERLIN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MCCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP
100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, SUITE 501
SAN JOSE, CA 95113
R.06-04-009

RYAN BERNARDO
BRAUN & BLAISING, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

CLARK BERNIER
RLW ANALYTICS
1055 BROADWAY, SUITE G
SONOMA, CA 95476
R.06-04-009

SARAH BESERRA
CALIFORNIA REPORTS
39 CASTLE HILL COURT
VALLEJO, CA 94591
R.06-04-009

CLARENCE BINNINGER
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
455 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE, SUITE 11000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

CHARLIE BLAIR
DELTA ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT
15 GREAT STUART STREET
EDINBURGH, UK EH2 7TP
UNITED KINGDOM
R.06-04-009

B.B. BLEVINS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET, MS-39
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

GREG BLUE
ENXCO DEVELOPMENT CORP.
5000 EXECUTIVE PARKWAY, STE.140
SAN RAMON, CA 94583
R.06-04-009

ASHLEE M. BONDS
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN&STEINER
LLP
101 SECOND STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

WILLIAM H. BOOTH
ATTORNEY AT LAW
LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM H. BOOTH
1500 NEWELL AVENUE, 5TH FLOOR
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

KEVIN BOUDREAU
CALPINE POWER AMERICA-CA, LLC
717 TEXAS AVENUE, SUITE 1000
HOUSTON, TX 77002
R.06-04-009

KYLE D. BOUDREAU
FPL GROUP
700 UNIVERSE BLVD., JES/JB
JUNO BEACH, FL 33408
R.06-04-009

KAREN BOWEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
101 CALIFORNIA STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

BIANCA BOWMAN
RATE CASE COORDINATOR
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000 MCB9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

ANDREW BRADFORD
SENIOR MARKET RESEARCH ASSOCIATE
FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES
9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE
LOUISVILLE, KY 40223
R.06-04-009

DAVID BRANCHCOMB
BRANCHCOMB ASSOCIATES, LLC
9360 OAKTREE LANE
ORANGEVILLE, CA 95662
R.06-04-009

DOWNEY BRAND
555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4686
R.06-04-009

CLARE BREIDENICH
224 1/2 24TH AVENUE EAST
SEATTLE, WA 98112
R.06-04-009

ADAM BRIONES
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704
R.06-04-009

GLORIA BRITTON
ANZA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.
PO BOX 391909
ANZA, CA 92539
R.06-04-009

DONALD BROOKHYSER
ALCANTAR & KAHL
1300 SW FIFTH AVE., SUITE 1750
PORTLAND, OR 97210
R.06-04-009

DONALD BROOKHYSER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ALCANTAR & KAHL
120 MONTGOMERY STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

DOUGLAS BROOKS
NEVADA POWER COMPANY
SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY
6226 WEST SAHARA AVENUE
LAS VEGAS, NV 89151
R.06-04-009

ANDREW BROWN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811
R.06-04-009

VERONIQUE BUGNION
POINT CARBON
205 SEVERN RIVER RD
SEVERNA PARK, MD 21146
R.06-04-009

JACK BURKE
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS MANAGER
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE
ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVE., SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
R.06-04-009

THERESA BURKE
SAN FRANCISCO PUC
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
R.06-04-009

PAM BURMICH
AIR RESOURCES BOARD
1001 I STREET, BOX 2815
SACRAMENTO, CA 95812
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

DALLAS BURTRAW
1616 P STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
R.06-04-009

JOSHUA BUSHINSKY
WESTERN POLICY COORDINATOR
PEW CENTER ON GLOBAL CLIMATE
CHANGE
2101 WILSON BLVD., SUITE 550
ARLINGTON, VA 95816
R.06-04-009

OLOF BYSTROM
DIRECTOR, WESTERN ENERGY
CAMBRIDGE ENERGY RESEARCH
ASSOCIATES
555 CALIFORNIA STREET, 3RD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

Eugene Cadenasso
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Andrew Campbell
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5304
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

TRENT A CARLSON
RELIANT ENERGY
1000 MAIN STREET
HOUSTON, TX 77001
R.06-04-009

SANDRA CAROLINA
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
PO BOX 98510
LAS VEGAS, NV 89193-8510
R.06-04-009

IAN CARTER
INTERNATIONAL EMISSIONS TRADING
ASSN.
350 SPARKS STREET, STE. 809
OTTAWA, ON K1R 7S8
CANADA
R.06-04-009

SHERYL CARTER
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

PHIL CARVER
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
625 MARION ST., NE
SALEM, OR 97301-3737
R.06-04-009

Bishu Chatterjee
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 3-E
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Theresa Cho
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5207
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

JENNIFER CHAMBERLIN
STRATEGIC ENERGY, LLC
2633 WELLINGTON CT.
CLYDE, CA 94520
R.06-04-009

AUDREY CHANG
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

CLIFF CHEN
UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTIST
2397 SHATTUCK AVENUE, STE 203
BERKELEY, CA 94704
R.06-04-009

WILLIAM H. CHEN
DIRECTOR, ENERGY POLICY WEST REGION
CONSTELLATION NEW ENERGY, INC.
ONE MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

BRIAN K. CHERRY
VICE PRESIDENT, REGULATORY
RELATIONS
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE: B10C
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

ED CHIANG
ELEMENT MARKETS, LLC
ONE SUGAR CREEK CENTER BLVD., SUITE
250
SUGAR LAND, TX 77478
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

STEVEN M. COHN
ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY
DISTRICT
PO BOX 15830
SACRAMENTO, CA 95852-1830
R.06-04-009

KENNETH A. COLBURN
SYMBILITIC STRATEGIES, LLC
26 WINTON ROAD
MEREDITH, NH 3253
R.06-04-009

ALAN COMNES
WEST COAST POWER
3934 SE ASH STREET
PORTLAND, OR 97214
R.06-04-009

LISA A. COTTLE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP
101 CALIFORNIA STREET, 39TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

RICHARD COWART
REGULATORY ASSISTANCE PROJECT
50 STATE STREET, SUITE 3
MONTPELIER, VT 5602
R.06-04-009

BRIAN T. CRAGG
ATTORNEY AT LAW
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

HOLLY B. CRONIN
STATE WATER PROJECT OPERATIONS DIV
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER
RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVE., LL-90
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821
R.06-04-009

SEBASTIEN CSAPO
PROJECT MANAGER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

RAYMOND J. CZAHAR, C.P.A.
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
WEST COAST GAS COMPANY
9203 BEATTY DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826
R.06-04-009

KARLA DAILEY
CITY OF PALO ALTO
BOX 10250
PALO ALTO, CA 94303
R.06-04-009

THOMAS DARTON
PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.
8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122
R.06-04-009

KYLE L. DAVIS
PACIFICORP
825 NE MULTNOMAH ST., SUITE 2000
PORTLAND, OR 97232
R.06-04-009

Matthew Deal
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5215
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

RONALD F. DEATON
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER &
POWER
111 NORTH HOPE STREET, ROOM 1550
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
R.06-04-009

LISA DECARLO
STAFF COUNSEL
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET MS-14
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

PAUL DELANEY
AMERICAN UTILITY NETWORK (A.U.N.)
10705 DEER CANYON DRIVE
ALTA LOMA, CA 91737
R.06-04-009

RALPH E. DENNIS
DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS
FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES
9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE, STE
2000
LOUISVILLE, KY 40223
R.06-04-009

LEONARD DEVANNA
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
CLEAN ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.
11330 SUNCO DRIVE, SUITE A
RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95742
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

BALDASSARO DI CAPO
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

WILLIAM F. DIETRICH
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DIETRICH LAW
2977 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, 613
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598-3535
R.06-04-009

TREVOR DILLARD
SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY
6100 NEIL ROAD, MS S4A50
RENO, NV 89520
R.06-04-009

THOMAS DILL
PRESIDENT
LODI GAS STORAGE, LLC
1021 MAIN ST STE 1500
HOUSTON, TX 77002-6509
R.06-04-009

JEFFREY DOLL
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
PO BOX 2815 1001 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95812
R.06-04-009

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
21700 OXNARD STREET, SUITE 1030
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91367
R.06-04-009

JASON DUBCHAK
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL
WILD GOOSE STORAGE, LLC
607 8TH AVENUE S.W.
CALGARY, AB T2P 0A7
CANADA
R.06-04-009

KIRBY DUSEL
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95670
R.06-04-009

PIERRE H. DUVAIR
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS-41
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

HARVEY EDER
PUBLIC SOLAR POWER COALITION
1218 12TH ST., 25
SANTA MONICA, CA 90401
R.06-04-009

DENNIS M.P. EHLLING
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART NICHOLSON
GRAHAM
10100 SANTA MONICA BLVD., 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067
R.06-04-009

THOMAS ELGIE
POWEREX CORPORATION
1400, 666 BURRAND ST
VANCOUVER, BC V6C 2X8
CANADA
R.06-04-009

SHAUN ELLIS
2183 UNION STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123
R.06-04-009

SANDRA ELY
NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT
1190 ST FRANCIS DRIVE
SANTA FE, NM 87501
R.06-04-009

NADAV ENBAR
ENERGY INSIGHTS
1750 14TH STREET, SUITE 200
BOULDER, CO 80302
R.06-04-009

STEVE ENDO
PASADENA DEPARTMENT OF WATER &
POWER
45 EAST GLENARM STREET
PASADENA, CA 91105
R.06-04-009

SAEED FARROKHPAY
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY
COMMISSION
110 BLUE RAVINE RD., SUITE 107
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

DIANE I. FELLMAN
DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS
FPL ENERGY PROJECT MANAGEMENT, INC.
234 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

Julie A. Fitch
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5119
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

MIKE FLORIO
ATTORNEY AT LAW
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

RYAN FLYNN
PACIFICORP
825 NE MULTNOMAH STREET, 18TH FLOOR
PORTLAND, OR 97232
R.06-04-009

Cathleen A. Fogel
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Jamie Fordyce
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 5-B
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

CYNTHIA A. FONNER
SENIOR COUNSEL
CONSTELLATION ENERGY GROUP INC
550 W. WASHINGTON ST, STE 300
CHICAGO, IL 60661
R.06-04-009

ORLANDO B. FOOTE, III
ATTORNEY AT LAW
HORTON, KNOX, CARTER & FOOTE
895 BROADWAY, SUITE 101
EL CENTRO, CA 92243
R.06-04-009

JONATHAN FORRESTER
PG&E
PO BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

KEVIN FOX
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
ONE MARKET STREET, SPEAR TOWER,
3300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

NORMAN J. FURUTA
ATTORNEY AT LAW
FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES
1455 MARKET ST., SUITE 1744
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103-1399
R.06-04-009

MICHELLE GARCIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD
1001 10TH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

LAURA GENAO
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
R.06-04-009

FIJI GEORGE
EL PASO CORPORATION
PO BOX 2511
HOUSTON, TX 77252
R.06-04-009

Anne Gillette
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

MELANIE GILLETTE
ENERNOC, INC.
115 HAZELMERE DRIVE
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

ANNETTE GILLIAM
SCE LAW DEPARTMENT
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
R.06-04-009

JULIE GILL
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MANAGER
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM
OPERATOR
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

HOWARD V. GOLUB
NIXON PEABODY LLP
2 EMBARCADERO CENTER, STE. 2700
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

HAYLEY GOODSON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

JAIRAM GOPAL
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
2244 WALNUT GROVE, GO1-C
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
R.06-04-009

KASSANDRA GOUGH
CALPINE CORPORATION
1127 11TH STREET, SUITE 242
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

Jacqueline Greig
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4102
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

JEFFREY P. GRAY
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-6533
R.06-04-009

JOSEPH GRECO
VICE PRESIDENT - WESTERN REGION
CAITHNESS ENERGY, LLC.
9590 PROTOTYPE COURT, SUITE 200
RENO, NV 89521
R.06-04-009

KRISTIN GRENFELL
PROJECT ATTORNEY, CALIF. ENERGY
PROGRAM
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

KAREN GRIFFIN
EXECUTIVE OFFICE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET, MS 39
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

ANN G. GRIMALDI
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
101 CALIFORNIA STREET, 41ST FLOOR
Center for Energy and Economic Development
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

YVONNE GROSS
REGULATORY POLICY MANAGER
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 ASH STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
R.06-04-009

ELSTON K. GRUBAUGH
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT
333 EAST BARIONI BLVD.
IMPERIAL, CA 92251
R.06-04-009

ELIZABETH W. HADLEY
CITY OF REDDING
777 CYPRESS AVENUE
REDDING, CA 96001
R.06-04-009

JEFFREY L. HAHN
COVANTA ENERGY CORPORATION
876 MT. VIEW DRIVE
LAFAYETTE, CA 94549
R.06-04-009

TOM HAMILTON
MANAGING PARTNER
ENERGY CONCIERGE SERVICES
321 MESA LILA RD
GLENDALE, CA 91208
R.06-04-009

PETER W. HANSCHEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP
101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 450
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596
R.06-04-009

ANDREW L. HARRIS
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000 MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

ARNO HARRIS
RECURRENT ENERGY, INC.
1700 MONTGOMERY ST., SUITE 251
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

JEFFERY D. HARRIS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

AUDRA HARTMANN
DYNEGY, INC.
980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 2130
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

ANITA HART
SENIOR SPECIALIST/STATE
REGULATORYAFFAIR
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
5241 SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD
LAS VEGAS, NV 89193
R.06-04-009

KERRY HATTEVIK
MIRANT CORPORATION
696 WEST 10TH STREET
PITTSBURG, CA 94565
R.06-04-009

LYNN HAUG
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-3109
R.06-04-009

MARCEL HAWIGER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

DAN HECHT
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 ASH STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
R.06-04-009

RICHARD HELGESON
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POWER
AUTHORI
225 S. LAKE AVE., SUITE 1250
PASADENA, CA 91101
R.06-04-009

UDI HELMAN
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYS. OPER.
CORP
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

TIM HEMIG
DIRECTOR
NRG ENERGY, INC.
1819 ASTON AVENUE, SUITE 105
CARLSBAD, CA 92008
R.06-04-009

JOSEPH HENRI
31 MIRAMONTE ROAD
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597
R.06-04-009

CHRISTOPHER A. HILEN
ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL
SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY
6100 NEIL ROAD
RENO, NV 89511
R.06-04-009

SETH HILTON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
STOEL RIVES
111 SUTTER ST., SUITE 700
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

GARY HINNERS
RELIANT ENERGY, INC.
PO BOX 148
HOUSTON, TX 77001-0148
R.06-04-009

ALDYN HOEKSTRA
PACE GLOBAL ENERGY SERVICES
420 WEST BROADWAY, 4TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
R.06-04-009

J. ANDREW HOERNER
REDEFINING PROGRESS
1904 FRANKLIN STREET
OAKLAND, CA 94612
R.06-04-009

LAURIE TEN HOPE
ADVISOR TO COMMISSIONER BYRON
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET, MS-32
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512
R.06-04-009

GEORGE HOPLEY
BARCLAYS CAPITAL
200 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10166
R.06-04-009

RANDY S. HOWARD
LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER AND
POWER
111 NORTH HOPE STREET, ROOM 921
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

DAVID L.. HUARD
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90064
R.06-04-009

JOHN P HUGHES
MANAGER, REGULATORY AFFAIRS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, STE. 2040
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

STEVEN HUHMEN
MORGAN STANLEY CAPITAL GROUP INC.
2000 WESTCHESTER AVENUE
PURCHASE, NY 10577
R.06-04-009

RAYMOND HUNG
PG&E
PO BOX 770000 MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

TAMLYN M. HUNT
ENERGY PROGRAM DIRECTOR
COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
26 W. ANAPAMU ST., 2ND FLOOR
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101
R.06-04-009

CAROL J. HURLOCK
CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVE. RM 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821
R.06-04-009

MICHAEL A. HYAMS
POWER ENTERPRISE-REGULATORY
AFFAIRS
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM
1155 MARKET ST., 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
R.06-04-009

Judith Ikle
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4012
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

AKBAR JAZAYEIRI
DIRECTOR OF REVENUE & TARRIFFS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. ROOM 390
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
R.06-04-009

PETER JAZAYERI
STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP
2029 CENTURY PARK EAST, SUITE 1800
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067
R.06-04-009

BRUNO JEIDER
BURBANK WATER & POWER
164 WEST MAGNOLIA BLVD.
BURBANK, CA 91502
R.06-04-009

JOHN JENSEN
PRESIDENT
MOUNTAIN UTILITIES
PO BOX. 205
KIRKWOOD, CA 95646
R.06-04-009

LEILANI JOHNSON KOWAL
LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER AND
POWER
111 N. HOPE STREET, ROOM 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
R.06-04-009

KENNETH C. JOHNSON
KENNETH CARLISLE JOHNSON
2502 ROBERTSON RD
SANTA CLARA, CA 95051
R.06-04-009

BRIAN M. JONES
M.J. BRADLEY & ASSOCIATES, INC.
47 JUNCTION SQUARE DRIVE
CONCORD, MA 1742
R.06-04-009

MARC D. JOSEPH
ADAMS BRADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BLVD., STE. 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
R.06-04-009

Sara M. Kamins
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

EVELYN KAHL
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

CATHY A. KARLSTAD
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE.
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
R.06-04-009

JOSEPH M. KARP
ATTORNEY AT LAW
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
101 CALIFORNIA STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-5802
R.06-04-009

SUE KATELEY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES
ASSN
PO BOX 782
RIO VISTA, CA 94571
R.06-04-009

ADAM J KATZ
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13TH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
R.06-04-009

JAMES W. KEATING
BP AMERICA, INC.
150 W. WARRENVILLE RD.
NAPERVILLE, IL 60563
R.06-04-009

CURTIS L. KEBLER
J. ARON & COMPANY
2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067
R.06-04-009

RANDALL W. KEEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90064
R.06-04-009

CAROLYN M. KEHREIN
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES
1505 DUNLAP COURT
DIXON, CA 95620-4208
R.06-04-009

ALEXIA C KELLY
THE CLIMATE TRUST
65 SW YAMHILL STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204
R.06-04-009

STEVEN KELLY
INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS
1215 K STREET, SUITE 900
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

DOUGLAS K. KERNER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

KHURSHID KHOJA
ASSOCIATE
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN &
STEINER
101 SECOND STREET, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

KIM KIENER
504 CATALINA BLVD.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92106
R.06-04-009

THOMAS S KIMBALL
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
1231 11TH STREET
MODESTO, CA 95354
R.06-04-009

DANIEL A. KING
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 ASH STREET, HQ 12
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
R.06-04-009

GREGORY KLATT
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
411 E. HUNTINGTON DRIVE, STE. 107-356
ARCADIA, CA 91006
R.06-04-009

JOSEPH R. KLOBERDANZ
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
PO BOX 1831
SAN DIEGO, CA 92112
R.06-04-009

STEPHEN G. KOERNER, ESQ.
EL PASO CORPORATION
2 NORTH NEVADA AVENUE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80903
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

GREGORY KOISER
CONSTELLATION NEW ENERGY, INC.
350 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 3800
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071
R.06-04-009

AVIS KOWALEWSKI
CALPINE CORPORATION
3875 HOPYARD ROAD, SUITE 345
PLEASANTON, CA 94588
R.06-04-009

STEVE KROMER
3110 COLLEGE AVENUE, APT 12
BERKELEY, CA 94705
R.06-04-009

CATHERINE M KRUPKA
MCDERMOTT WILL AND EMERY LLP
600 THIRTEEN STREEET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
R.06-04-009

LARS KVALE
CENTER FOR RESOURCE SOLUTIONS
PO BOX 39512
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94129
R.06-04-009

Jonathan Lakritz
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5020
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

STEPHANIE LA SHAWN
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

GERALD L. LAHR
ABAG POWER
101 EIGHTH STREET
OAKLAND, CA 94607
R.06-04-009

MIKE LAMOND
ALPINE NATURAL GAS OPERATING CO. #1
LLC
PO BOX 550
VALLEY SPRINGS, CA 95252
R.06-04-009

JOHN LAUN
APOGEE INTERACTIVE, INC.
1220 ROSECRANS ST., SUITE 308
SAN DIEGO, CA 92106
R.06-04-009

Diana L. Lee
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

VITALY LEE
AES ALAMITOS, LLC
690 N. STUDEBAKER ROAD
LONG BEACH, CA 90803
R.06-04-009

BRENDA LEMAY
DIRECTOR
HORIZON WIND ENERGY
1600 SHATTUCK, SUITE 222
BERKELEY, CA 94709
R.06-04-009

NICHOLAS LENSSEN
ENERGY INSIGHTS
1750 14TH STREET, SUITE 200
BOULDER, CO 80302
R.06-04-009

JOHN W. LESLIE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS,
LLP
11988 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 200
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130
R.06-04-009

DONALD C. LIDDELL, PC
DOUGLAS & LIDDELL
2928 2ND AVENUE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
R.06-04-009

KAREN LINDH
CALIFORNIA ONSITE GENERATION
7909 WALERGA ROAD, NO. 112, PMB119
ANTELOPE, CA 95843
R.06-04-009

STEVEN G. LINS
GENERAL COUNSEL
GLENDALE WATER AND POWER
613 EAST BROADWAY, SUITE 220
GLENDALE, CA 91206-4394
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

STEVEN A. LIPMAN
STEVEN LIPMAN CONSULTING
500 N. STREET 1108
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

GRACE LIVINGSTON-NUNLEY
ASSISTANT PROJECT MANAGER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000 MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

BILL LOCKYER
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPT OF JUSTICE
PO BOX 944255
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2550
R.06-04-009

JODY S. LONDON
JODY LONDON CONSULTING
PO BOX 3629
OAKLAND, CA 94609
R.06-04-009

LAD LORENZ
V.P. REGULATORY AFFAIRS
SEMPRA UTILITIES
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 2060
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

BARRY LOVELL
15708 POMERADO RD., SUITE 203
POWAY, CA 92064
R.06-04-009

BOB LUCAS
LUCAS ADVOCATES
1121 L STREET, SUITE 407
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

ED LUCHA
CASE COORDINATOR
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

JANE E. LUCKHARDT
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DOWNEY BRAND LLP
555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

LYNELLE LUND
COMMERCE ENERGY, INC.
600 ANTON BLVD., SUITE 2000
COSTA MESA, CA 92626
R.06-04-009

MARY LYNCH
VP - REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE
AFFAIRS
CONSTELLATION ENERGY COMMODITIES
GROUP
2377 GOLD MEDAL WAY, SUITE 100
GOLD RIVER, CA 95670
R.06-04-009

Jaclyn Marks
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5306
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

DOUGLAS MACMULLEN
CHIEF, POWER PLANNING SECTION
CA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVE., ROOM 356
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821
R.06-04-009

AMBER MAHONE
ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS,
INC.
101 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1600
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

ANNABELLE MALINS
CONSUL-SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
BRITISH CONSULATE-GENERAL
ONE SANSOME STREET, SUITE 850
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

DEREK MARKOLF
CALIFORNIA CLIMATE ACTION REGISTRY
515 S. FLOWER STREET, SUITE 1640
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071
R.06-04-009

CHRIS MARNAY
1 CYCLOTRON RD MS 90R4000
BERKELEY, CA 94720-8136
R.06-04-009

JULIE L. MARTIN
WEST ISO COORDINATOR
NORTH AMERICA GAS AND POWER
501 WESTLAKE PARK BLVD.
HOUSTON, TX 77079
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

MARTIN A. MATTES
NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT,
LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 3400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

DANIELLE MATTHEWS SEPERAS
CALPINE CORPORATION
1127 11TH STREET, SUITE 242
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

MICHAEL MAZUR
CHIEF TECHNICAL OFFICER
3 PHASES RENEWABLES, LLC
2100 SEPULVEDA BLVD., SUITE 37
MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
R.06-04-009

Wade McCartney
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

ANDREW MCALLISTER
DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE
ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVE., SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
R.06-04-009

THOMAS MCCABE
EDISON MISSION ENERGY
18101 VON KARMAN AVE., SUITE 1700
IRVINE, CA 92612
R.06-04-009

RICHARD MCCANN, PH.D
M.CUBED
2655 PORTAGE BAY, SUITE 3
DAVIS, CA 95616
R.06-04-009

BARRY F. MCCARTHY
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MCCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP
100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, SUITE 501
SAN JOSE, CA 95113
R.06-04-009

KEITH R. MCCREA
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN, LLP
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2415
R.06-04-009

MARY MCDONALD
DIRECTOR OF STATE AFFAIRS
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM
OPERATOR
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

JEN MCGRAW
CENTER FOR NEIGHBORHOOD
TECHNOLOGY
PO BOX 14322
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
R.06-04-009

BRUCE MCLAUGHLIN
BRAUN & BLAISING P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

RACHEL MCMAHON
CEERT
1100 11TH STREET, SUITE 311
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

BRIAN MCQUOWN
RELIANT ENERGY
7251 AMIGO ST., SUITE 120
LAS VEGAS, NV 89119
R.06-04-009

ELENA MELLO
SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY
6100 NEIL ROAD
RENO, NV 89520
R.06-04-009

DARYL METZ
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH ST., MS-20
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

STEVEN S. MICHEL
WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES
2025 SENDA DE ANDRES
SANTA FE, NM 87501
R.06-04-009

ROSS A. MILLER
ELECTRICITY ANALYSIS OFFICE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET MS 20
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

KAREN NORENE MILLS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
R.06-04-009

MARCIE MILNER
DIRECTOR - REGULATORY AFFAIRS
SHELL TRADING GAS & POWER COMPANY
4445 EASTGATE MALL, SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121
R.06-04-009

SAMARA MINDEL
REGULATORY AFFAIRS ANALYST
FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES
9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE, SUITE
2000
LOUISVILLE, KY 40223
R.06-04-009

CYNTHIA MITCHELL
ENERGY ECONOMICS, INC.
530 COLGATE COURT
RENO, NV 89503
R.06-04-009

Ed Moldavsky
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5125
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Rahmon Momoh
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4205
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Beth Moore
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4103
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Harvey Y. Morris
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5036
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Lainie Motamedi
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5119
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

DAVID L. MODISETTE
CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC TRANSP.
COALITION
1015 K STREET, SUITE 200
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

WES MONIER
STRATEGIC ISSUES AND PLANNING
MANAGER
TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT
333 EAST CANAL DRIVE, PO BOX 949
TURLOCK, CA 95381-0949
R.06-04-009

ROGER C. MONTGOMERY
VICE PRESIDENT, PRICING
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
PO BOX 98510
LAS VEGAS, NV 89193-8510
R.06-04-009

RONALD MOORE
GOLDEN STATE WATER/BEAR VALLEY
ELECTRIC
630 EAST FOOTHILL BOULEVARD
SAN DIMAS, CA 91773
R.06-04-009

RICHARD J. MORILLO
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF BURBANK
215 E. OLIVE AVENUE
BURBANK, CA 91502
R.06-04-009

GREGG MORRIS
DIRECTOR
GREEN POWER INSTITUTE
2039 SHATTUCK AVENUE, STE 402
BERKELEY, CA 94704
R.06-04-009

STEVEN MOSS
SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY POWER
COOP
2325 3RD STREET, SUITE 344
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120
R.06-04-009

MATTHEW MOST
EDISON MISSION MARKETING & TRADING,
INC.
160 FEDERAL STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110-1776
R.06-04-009

Scott Murtishaw
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009
Monday, January 7, 2008

PHILLIP J. MULLER
SCD ENERGY SOLUTIONS
436 NOVA ALBION WAY
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903
R.06-04-009

CLYDE MURLEY
CONSULTANT TO NRDC
1031 ORDWAY STREET
ALBANY, CA 94706
R.06-04-009

Richard A. Myers
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

SARA STECK MYERS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
122 28TH AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
R.06-04-009

JESSICA NELSON
PLUMAS-SIERRA RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OP
73233 STATE ROUTE 70, STE A
PORTOLA, CA 96122-7064
R.06-04-009

DAVID NEMTZOW
1254 9TH STREET, NO. 6
SANTA MONICA, CA 90401
R.06-04-009

SID NEWSOM
TARIFF MANAGER
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 WEST 5TH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90051
R.06-04-009

DESPINA NIEHAUS
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32H
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530
R.06-04-009

SEPHRA A. NINOW
POLICY ANALYST
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE
ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVENUE, SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
R.06-04-009

RICK C. NOGER
PRAXAIR PLAINFIELD, INC.
2711 CENTERVILLE ROAD, SUITE 400
WILMINGTON, DE 19808
R.06-04-009

RITA NORTON
RITA NORTON AND ASSOCIATES, LLC
18700 BLYTHSWOOD DRIVE,
LOS GATOS, CA 95030
R.06-04-009

TIMOTHY R. ODIL
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1875 LAWRENCE STREET, SUITE 200
Center for Energy and Economic Development
DENVER, CO 80202
R.06-04-009

ALVIN PAK
SEMPRA GLOBAL ENTERPRISES
101 ASH STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
R.06-04-009

LAURIE PARK
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95670-6078
R.06-04-009

LORRAINE PASKETT
DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE AND REG.
AFFAIRS
LA DEPT. OF WATER & POWER
111 N. HOWARD ST., ROOM 1536
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
R.06-04-009

SHERIDAN J. PAUKER
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
ONE MARKET ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

JOSEPH PAUL
SENIOR CORPORATE COUNSEL
DYNEGY, INC.
4140 DUBLIN BLVD., STE. 100
DUBLIN, CA 94568
R.06-04-009

Joel T. Perlstein
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5133
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

CARL PECHMAN
POWER ECONOMICS
901 CENTER STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
R.06-04-009

NORMAN A. PEDERSEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
HANNA AND MORTON, LLP
444 SOUTH FLOWER STREET, NO. 1500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071
R.06-04-009

JAN PEPPER
CLEAN POWER MARKETS, INC.
418 BENVENUE AVENUE
LOS ALTOS, CA 94024
R.06-04-009

CARLA PETERMAN
UCEI
2547 CHANNING WAY
BERKELEY, CA 94720
R.06-04-009

COLIN PETHERAM
DIRECTOR-REGULATORY
SBC CALIFORNIA
140 NEW MONTGOMERY ST., SUITE 1325
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

ROBERT L. PETTINATO
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER &
POWER
111 NORTH HOPE STREET, SUITE 1151
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
R.06-04-009

PHILIP D. PETTINGILL
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM
OPERATOR
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

Paul S Phillips
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4101
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

GORDON PICKERING
PRINCIPAL
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95670-6078
R.06-04-009

EDWARD G. POOLE
ANDERSON DONOVAN & POOLE
601 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
R.06-04-009

JENNIFER PORTER
POLICY ANALYST
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE
ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVENUE, SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
R.06-04-009

BRIAN POTTS
Foley & Lardner
150 East Gilman Street
1497
MADISON, WI 53701-1497
R.06-04-009

VIDHYA PRABHAKARAN
GOODIN,MACBRIDE,SQUERI,DAY,LAMPREY
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

RASHA PRINCE
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 WEST 5TH STREET, GT14D6
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013
R.06-04-009

JJ PRUCNAL
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
PO BOX 98510
LAS VEGAS, NV 89193-8510
R.06-04-009

MARC PRYOR
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH ST., MS-20
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

BALWANT S. PUREWAL
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVE., LL-90
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821
R.06-04-009

Kristin Ralff Douglas
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5119
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

BARRY RABE
1427 ROSS STREET
PLYMOUTH, MI 48170
R.06-04-009

STEVE RAHON
DIRECTOR, TARIFF & REGULATORY
ACCOUNTS
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32C
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1548
R.06-04-009

TIFFANY RAU
POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS MANAGER
CARSON HYDROGEN POWER PROJECT LLC
ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER, SUITE 1600
LONG BEACH, CA 90831-1600
R.06-04-009

JOHN R. REDDING
ARCTURUS ENERGY CONSULTING
44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE
MENDOCINO, CA 95460
R.06-04-009

ROBERT J. REINHARD
MORRISON AND FOERSTER
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2482
R.06-04-009

DAVID REYNOLDS
MEMBER SERVICES MANAGER
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY
160 CIRBY WAY
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678-6420
R.06-04-009

JANILL RICHARDS
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S
OFFICE
1515 CLAY STREET, 20TH FLOOR
OAKLAND, CA 94702
R.06-04-009

Steve Roscow
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

THEODORE ROBERTS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SEMPRA GLOBAL
101 ASH STREET, HQ 13D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3017
R.06-04-009

GRANT ROSENBLUM, ESQ.
CALIFORNIA ISO
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

JAMES ROSS
RCS, INC.
500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, SUITE 320
CHESTERFIELD, MO 63017
R.06-04-009

ROBERT K. ROZANSKI
LOS ANGELES DEPT OF WATER AND
POWER
111 NORTH HOPE STREET, ROOM 1520
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
R.06-04-009

Nancy Ryan
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5217
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Pearlie Sabino
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4209
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Jason R. Salmi Klotz
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

RANDY SABLE
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
5241 SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD
LAS VEGAS, NV 89193
R.06-04-009

SAM SADLER
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
625 NE MARION STREET
SALEM, OR 97301-3737
R.06-04-009

JUDITH B. SANDERS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM
OPERATOR
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

SOUMYA SASTRY
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
R.06-04-009

Don Schultz
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

JANINE L. SCANCARELLI
FOLGER LEVIN & KAHN LLP
275 BATTERY STREET, 23RD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

MICHAEL SCHEIBLE
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
1001 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95677
R.06-04-009

JENINE SCHENK
APS ENERGY SERVICES
400 E. VAN BUREN STREET, SUITE 750
PHOENIX, AZ 85004
R.06-04-009

STEVEN SCHILLER
SCHILLER CONSULTING, INC.
111 HILLSIDE AVENUE
PIEDMONT, CA 94611
R.06-04-009

STEVEN S. SCHLEIMER
DIRECTOR, COMPLIANCE & REGULATORY
AFFAIRS
BARCLAYS BANK, PLC
200 PARK AVENUE, FIFTH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10166
R.06-04-009

REED V. SCHMIDT
VICE PRESIDENT
BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES
1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE
BERKELEY, CA 94703
R.06-04-009

DONALD SCHOENBECK
RCS, INC.
900 WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 780
VANCOUVER, WA 98660
R.06-04-009

BILL SCHRAND
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATON
PO BOX 98510
LAS VEGAS, NV 89193-8510
R.06-04-009

CYNTHIA SCHULTZ
REGULATORY FILING COORDINATOR
PACIFIC POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
825 N.E. MULTNOMAH
PORTLAND, OR 97232
R.06-04-009

LISA SCHWARTZ
SENIOR ANALYST
ORGEON PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
PO BOX 2148
SALEM, OR 97308-2148
R.06-04-009

MONICA A. SCHWEBS, ESQ.
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
1333 N. CALIFORNIA BLVD., SUITE 210
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596
R.06-04-009

PAUL M. SEBY
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1875 LAWRENCE STREET, SUITE 200
DENVER, CO 80202
R.06-04-009

BETTY SETO
POLICY ANALYST
KEMA, INC.
492 NINTH STREET, SUITE 220
OAKLAND, CA 94607
R.06-04-009

NORA SHERIFF
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

Sean A. Simon
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

KYLE SILON
ECOSECURITIES CONSULTING LIMITED
529 SE GRAND AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97214
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

DAN SILVERIA
SURPRISE VALLEY ELECTRIC
CORPORATION
PO BOX 691
ALTURAS, CA 96101
R.06-04-009

KEVIN J. SIMONSEN
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES
646 EAST THIRD AVENUE
DURANGO, CO 81301
R.06-04-009

DAN SKOPEC
CLIMATE & ENERGY CONSULTING
1201 K STREET SUITE 970
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

DEBORAH SLON
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
ENVIRONMENT
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
1300 I STREET, 15TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

Donald R. Smith
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4209
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

GLORIA D. SMITH
ADAMS, BROADWELL, JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
R.06-04-009

KELLIE SMITH
SENATE ENERGY/UTILITIES &
COMMUNICATION
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 4038
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

RICHARD SMITH
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
1231 11TH STREET
MODESTO, CA 95352-4060
R.06-04-009

ROBIN SMUTNY-JONES
CALIFORNIA ISO
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

JEANNE M. SOLE
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, RM.
234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

DARRELL SOYARS
MANAGER-RESOURCE
PERMITTING&STRATEGIC
SIERRA PACIFIC RESOURCES
6100 NEIL ROAD
RENO, NV 89520-0024
R.06-04-009

JAMES D. SQUERI
ATTORNEY AT LAW
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY
LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, STE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

SEEMA SRINIVASAN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

F. Jackson Stoddard
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5040
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Elizabeth Stoltzfus
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

ANNIE STANGE
ALCANTAR & KAHL
1300 SW FIFTH AVE., SUITE 1750
PORTLAND, OR 97201
R.06-04-009

FRANK STERN
SUMMIT BLUE CONSULTING
1722 14TH STREET, SUITE 230
BOULDER, CO 80302
R.06-04-009

PATRICK STONER
PROGRAM DIRECTOR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION
1303 J STREET, SUITE 250
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

NINA SUETAKE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVE., STE 350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

KENNY SWAIN
NAVIGANT CONSULTING
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95670
R.06-04-009

George S Tagnipes
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ENERGY DIVISION AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

Christine S Tam
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 4209
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

JAMES W. TARNAGHAN
DUANE MORRIS LLP
ONE MARKET, SPEAR TOWER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

WEBSTER TASAT
AIR RESOURCES BOARD
1001 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

ROBERT R. TAYLOR
AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND
POWER DIST.
1600 NORTH PRIEST DRIVE, PAB221
TEMPE, AZ 85281
R.06-04-009

Charlotte TerKeurst
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
ROOM 5117
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

KAREN TERRANOVA
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, STE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

PATRICIA THOMPSON
SUMMIT BLUE CONSULTING
2920 CAMINO DIABLO, SUITE 210
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597
R.06-04-009

DEAN R. TIBBS
PRESIDENT
ADVANCED ENERGY STRATEGIES, INC.
1390 WILLOW PASS ROAD, SUITE 610
CONCORD, CA 94520
R.06-04-009

EDWARD J TIEDEMANN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
KRONICK, MOSKOVITZ, TIEDEMANN &
GIRARD
400 CAPITOL MALL, 27TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4416
R.06-04-009

SCOTT TOMASHEFSKY
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY
180 CIRBY WAY
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678-6420
R.06-04-009

WAYNE TOMLINSON
EL PASO CORPORATION
2 NORTH NEVADA AVENUE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80903
R.06-04-009

Lana Tran
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 2-D
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

ALLEN TRIAL
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
101 ASH STREET, HQ-12
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
R.06-04-009

NANCY TRONAAS
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH ST. MS-20
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512
R.06-04-009

ANN L. TROWBRIDGE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DAY CARTER & MURPHY, LLP
3620 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE 205
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

ANDREW J. VAN HORN
VAN HORN CONSULTING
12 LIND COURT
ORINDA, CA 94563
R.06-04-009

ROGER VAN HOY
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
1231 11TH STREET
MODESTO, CA 95354
R.06-04-009

BETH VAUGHAN
CALIFORNIA COGENERATION COUNCIL
4391 N. MARSH ELDER COURT
CONCORD, CA 94521
R.06-04-009

EDWARD VINE
LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL
LABORATORY
BUILDING 90R4000
BERKELEY, CA 94720
R.06-04-009

SYMONE VONGDEUANE
SEMPRA ENERGY SOLUTIONS
101 ASH STREET, HQ09
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3017
R.06-04-009

BARRY R. WALLERSTEIN
EXECUTIVE OFFICER
SOUTH COAST AQMD
21865 COPLEY DRIVE
DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765-4182
R.06-04-009

DEVRA WANG
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
R.06-04-009

CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120-7442
R.06-04-009

JOY A. WARREN
REGULATORY ADMINISTRATOR
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
1231 11TH STREET
MODESTO, CA 95354
R.06-04-009

Pamela Wellner
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
R.06-04-009

LISA WEINZIMER
CALIFORNIA ENERGY REPORTER
PLATTS MCGRAW-HILL
695 NINTH AVENUE, NO. 2
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118
R.06-04-009

RAY WELCH
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
ONE MARKET PLAZA, SUITE 1200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
R.06-04-009

VIRGIL WELCH
CLIMATE CAMPAIGN COORDINATOR
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE
1107 9TH STREET, SUITE 540
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

JOHN B. WELDON, JR.
SALMON, LEWIS & WELDON, P.L.C.
2850 EAST CAMELBACK ROAD, SUITE 200
PHOENIX, AZ 85016
R.06-04-009

ANDREA WELER
STRATEGIC ENERGY
3130 D BALFOUR RD., SUITE 290
BRENTWOOD, CA 94513
R.06-04-009

ELIZABETH WESTBY
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
1300 SW FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 1750
PORTLAND, OR 97201
R.06-04-009

WILLIAM W. WESTERFIELD, 111
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

BRAD WETSTONE
236 HARTFORD STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

S. NANCY WHANG
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90064
R.06-04-009

GREGGORY L. WHEATLAND
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

JOSEPH F. WIEDMAN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY &
LAMPREY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
R.06-04-009

KATHRYN WIG
PARALEGAL
NRG ENERGY, INC
211 CARNEGIE CENTER
PRINCETON, NY 8540
R.06-04-009

VALERIE J. WINN
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177-0001
R.06-04-009

REID A. WINTHROP
PILOT POWER GROUP, INC
8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE SUITE 520
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122
R.06-04-009

RYAN WISER
BERKELEY LAB
ONE CYCLOTRON ROAD
BERKELEY, CA 94720
R.06-04-009

ELLEN WOLFE
RESERO CONSULTING
9289 SHADOW BROOK PL.
GRANITE BAY, CA 95746
R.06-04-009

KEVIN WOODRUFF
WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES
1100 K STREET, SUITE 204
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

DON WOOD
PACIFIC ENERGY POLICY CENTER
4539 LEE AVENUE
LA MESA, CA 91941
R.06-04-009

CATHY S. WOOLLUMS
MIDAMERICAN ENERGY HOLDINGS
COMPANY
106 EAST SECOND STREET
DAVENPORT, IA 52801
R.06-04-009

E.J. WRIGHT
OCCIDENTAL POWER SERVICES, INC.
5 GREENWAY PLAZA, SUITE 110
HOUSTON, TX 77046
R.06-04-009

JUSTIN C. WYNNE
BRAU & BLAISING, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
R.06-04-009

HUGH YAO
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 W. 5TH ST, GT22G2
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013
R.06-04-009

JEANNE ZAIONTZ
BP ENERGY COMPANY
501 WESTLAKE PARK BLVD, RM. 4328
HOUSTON, TX 77079
R.06-04-009

ELIZABETH ZELLJADT
1725 I STREET, N.W. SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20006
R.06-04-009

DAVID ZONANA
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S
OFFICE
455 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE, SUITE 11000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
R.06-04-009

MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.
1814 FRANKLIN STREET, SUITE 720
OAKLAND, CA 94612
R.06-04-009

R.06-04-009

Monday, January 7, 2008

CALIFORNIA ISO
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM, CA 95630
R.06-04-009

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
517-B POTRERO AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110
R.06-04-009