

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Examine the
Commission's Post-2008 Energy Efficiency
Policies, Programs, Evaluation, Measurement,
and Verification, and Related Issues.

Rulemaking 09-11-014
(Filed November 20, 2009)

**COMMENTS OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 39 M)
TO ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S RULING**

LISE H. JORDAN
MICHAEL R. KLOTZ

Law Department
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
P.O. Box 7442
77 Beale Street, MSB30A
San Francisco, CA 94120
Telephone: (415) 973-7565
Facsimile: (415) 973-0516
E-Mail: mike@pge.com

Attorneys for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: July 16, 2010

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Examine the Commission's Post-2008 Energy Efficiency Policies, Programs, Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification, and Related Issues.

Rulemaking 09-11-014
(Filed November 20, 2009)

**COMMENTS OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 39 M)
TO ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S RULING**

In accordance with the July 2, 2010 *Assigned Commissioner's Ruling* (ACR) Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) submits the following comments.

I. INTRODUCTION

PG&E supports the California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission or CPUC) efforts to take stock of California's current Energy Efficiency framework and to make the necessary changes required in the Commission's Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) practices to ensure more effective measurement of both efficiency resource objectives and progress in achieving the goals of the California Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan). Accordingly, PG&E believes that the questions enumerated in both the May 21, 2010 *Assigned Commissioner Ruling and Scoping Memo, Phase I* (May 21 ACR) and in the current ACR are appropriate to consider within the scope of the comprehensive review of EM&V institutions and frameworks. However, as PG&E and many other parties commented in their June 4, 2010 comments to the May 21 ACR, many of the broad policy and technical questions posed in the May 21 ACR are not appropriate for resolution solely through solicitation of written party comments. Rather, several parties recommended first retaining a qualified consultant to lead a comprehensive review and assist in resolving these issues (per D.09-09-047) and also engaging a broad coalition of stakeholders including industry experts, state agencies and others in a workshop-style process so that the parties and the Commission can ultimately make informed decisions as to these issues. As the current ACR probes deeper into the issues presented in

the May 21 ACR, PG&E again recommends that the Commission should not attempt to resolve such important policy and technical issues through submission of party comments alone.

In addition, in PG&E's response to the March 3, 2010 *Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Setting Prehearing Conference* in this proceeding¹, PG&E commented that before examining such broad policy issues or trying to determine which evaluation protocols require technical updates, it is appropriate to first set in place the foundation of the 2013-2015 energy efficiency programs themselves, including examination of cost-effectiveness issues, setting the program goals in coordination with the ongoing energy efficiency incentive proceeding (R.09-01-019) and determining whether the Commission will update the Strategic Plan. Once the foundation is established, then the policies and technical protocols to guide evaluation² of the savings delivered by energy programs can be put into place.

Of the questions posed in the ACR, the most appropriate and important for resolution at this time is Question 4.3, which investigates how a working group of evaluation practitioners and other stakeholders might be formed to explore best practices and increase collaboration. This is precisely the sort of entity that should be formed to discuss questions of a policy and/or technical nature, such as those posed in the ACR, with the goal of educating a broad coalition of stakeholders and presenting their recommendations to the Commission. Similar working groups have operated successfully in the past in California. Forming such a group would provide an effective way of moving toward a more collaborative system as envisioned in the *2010 – 2012 Joint Energy Division and IOU Evaluation Measurement and Verification Plan*, and ultimately play a pivotal role in helping to fix a broken EM&V process.

///

///

///

¹*Pacific Gas And Electric Company's (U 39 M) Response To Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Setting Prehearing Conference* (Filed March 15, 2010), at Sec. II, pp.3-6.

² Impact evaluation is intended to estimate energy savings, explain how the savings were achieved, and provide recommendations for improvements.

II. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS IN THE ACR

Question 4.1: EM&V Objectives

A. Several parties suggest adding a reference to the Strategic Plan’s goal of market transformation to the Commission’s adopted EM&V objectives. In particular, DRA proposes adding the following phrase to the “Market Assessment” objective adopted in D.09-09-047: “The goal of market assessment is to identify a common set of Market Transformation definitions based on CPUC assigned market indicators, which will allow the Commission to determine when market transformation has occurred for a program.” Do parties support the addition of this phrase to the Market Assessment objective?

Response: PG&E does not support the addition of DRA’s proposed language to the Market Assessment objective at this time. The language proposed by DRA implies that the only goal of market assessment research is to identify market transformation metrics. The scope of market assessment research is much broader than that and as such, the proposed language should not be adopted.

Further, such an addition is not necessary. The Strategic Plan is akin to a roadmap to market transformation. Creation of a “new plan” for essentially the same purpose is duplicative and administratively burdensome. The IOUs have recently developed and submitted metrics geared toward tracking the progress in achieving market transformation objectives.

Finally, as PG&E stated in its reply comments to the May 21, 2010 ACR it would be premature to adopt such proposed revisions to EM&V goals based solely on written comments submitted thus far. Proposed revisions such as DRA’s proposed language should be adopted only after being fully vetted by stakeholders in a workshop setting.³

///

///

///

///

³ Reply Comments Of Pacific Gas And Electric Company (U 39 M) To Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling And Scoping Memo, Phase I, pp. 4-5.

B. Do parties support SCE’s suggestion that the Market Assessment objective be expanded to specify that the purpose of Market Assessment is to assist the Commission in “[m]onitoring and guiding progress on meeting the goals of the Strategic Plan; and guiding updates to the Strategic Plan by providing new information about what market changes are most feasible and cost-effective”?

Response: PG&E supports the proposition that formative research can be used as a tool to provide information regarding the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of changes to the Strategic Plan. For the reasons stated in PG&E’s response to Question 4.1A, PG&E recommends that proposed revisions to the EM&V goals be considered for adoption only after stakeholders have had the opportunity to fully discuss them in a workshop setting as part of the comprehensive EM&V review.

C. Can the suggestions in questions 1 and 2 above be reconciled and, if so, how?

Response: Yes. PG&E believes the purpose of the Strategic Plan is to be the guiding light of market transformation efforts. Parties should support this existing document, not create a new one.

Question 4.2: Macro Consumption Metrics

A. The NRDC supports and encourages exploration of Macro Consumption Metrics as a supplement to, but not replacement of, the current energy and demand saving metrics. Do parties agree with NRDC?

Response: PG&E agrees that Macro Consumption Metrics should be explored as a supplement to, but not a replacement for other evaluation metrics.

a. If Macro Consumption Metrics cannot replace current impact evaluation practices, do they offer other benefits?

Response: Yes. Macro Consumption Metrics allow us to see if we are advancing in the overall goal of reduced total energy use and GHG emissions.

b. The NRDC suggests Macro Consumption Metrics are necessary to “help inform progress towards the state’s objective to limit greenhouse gas emissions.” However, SCE argues that converting existing energy savings metrics to GHG emission reductions is sufficient to accomplish the same goal. Which perspective is most valid?

Response: NRDC and SCE’s positions answer different questions regarding the State’s efforts towards mitigating GHG emissions. The macro consumption metrics look at all of California’s GHG emissions. SCE’s proposal provides an estimate of the GHG emissions saved as a

result of the energy efficiency programs. In essence, each proposal answers a different question, making both valid for what each seeks to accomplish.

B. Do parties agree with PG&E’s suggestion that the inherent limitation of Macro Consumption Metrics is that “factors outside of the energy efficiency arena could skew the perceived effect of the energy efficiency programs themselves?”

a. Is it possible to control for factors like economic activity or electrification of transportation such that the impact of energy efficiency is more evident?

Response: PG&E does not believe that it is possible to control for such factors given their current uncertainties. The challenges of how to appropriately account for factors such as the current economic downturn (both the reduction in overall consumption and the effect on ongoing projects) was evident in the ex post 2006-08 energy efficiency impact evaluation effort and was ultimately, not taken into account. In addition, there are many unknown variables with respect to electrification of transportation (i.e. the time of day that individuals may choose to charge their vehicles and how many will operate) that make this factor impossible to control for at the current time. While Macro Consumption metrics may provide a signal with respect to overall consumption, they will not provide understanding of how energy efficiency fits into the overall consumption model. As a result, the perceived effect of energy efficiency in light of these other variant factors could be skewed or masked.

b. Would the availability of certain data strengthen Macro Consumption Metrics? If so, what data, if any, would improve the reliability of econometric evaluations?

Response: For the reasons discussed in response to Question 4.2B, PG&E does not believe that Macro Consumption can control for variant factors given the data available today. However, this issue is one that should be presented by experts in this particular field through a workshop process before the Commission considers adoption of Macro Consumption as a metric.

///

C. Would the addition of a Macro Consumption Metric comparable to that suggested by Horowitz, or other approaches, provide more certain measures of the aggregate impact of California’s energy efficiency policies than is available through existing EM&V?

Response: For the reasons discussed in response to Question 4.2B, PG&E does not believe that the addition of Macro Consumption metrics will provide more certain, or less contentious, measure of California’s EE achievements than current EM&V efforts. The macro consumption metrics provide information to measure success in meeting overall societal goals such as reducing emissions of GHGs. At the core, the problem with using macro consumption metrics is that the impact of energy efficiency could be buried by other “noise” in the markets, economy, or weather. In addition, as discussed in response to Question 4.2B, it is impossible to control for all variant factors in a Macro Consumption model, such that the energy efficiency portion of the total consumption estimates would be obvious. Furthermore, even if macro consumption metrics are able to produce accurate results, they will not be able to provide insight into how the savings were achieved. Understanding how savings occur is a critical goal of impact evaluation used to inform future program design and decision making.

D. Would the addition of a Macro Consumption Metric comparable to that suggested by Horowitz, or other approaches, provide evaluation results more quickly than existing EM&V?

Response: Yes, it may quickly provide an understanding of how much total energy is being used. It will not provide uncontroversial results or guidance as to how that amount of energy is being used, the role the energy efficiency portfolios played in reducing overall consumption, or how to improve the portfolio offerings.

Question 4.3: EM&V Beyond California

A. Parties suggest California establish a working group of evaluation practitioners and users to explore best practices for California and facilitate increased collaboration. What form would this working group take?

Response: The working group would consist of a broad coalition of stakeholders including representatives from Energy Division, the IOUs, state agencies, ratepayer advocacy groups, environmental groups, industry experts, evaluation practitioners and consultants, and others. Details

regarding its proposed responsibilities, governance and relationship to the Commission are described in the subsections below.

a. What should be the responsibilities of such a group?

Response: Generally speaking, the group would be responsible to act in an advisory role to the Commission. The working group would address technical and policy-related evaluation issues and make recommendations to the Commission for their resolution.

California has previously employed technical working groups; the current California Measurement Advisory Council (CALMAC) and its predecessor the California Demand-Side Management Measurement Advisory Council (CADMAC) were valuable assets to regulators, the IOUs, and other stakeholders both within California and on the national level. The vision for the working group is to provide a forum for stakeholders to discuss policy issues related to the evaluation of energy efficiency efforts in California. Among other things, the group would address issues related to portfolio design and optimization, evaluation of specific offerings, and coordinate and set broad, long-term goals for research efforts. In addition, the working group would provide a forum for stakeholders to discuss and resolve evaluation issues as they arise, as well as providing the opportunity for ongoing collaboration, dialogue, engagement and peer review of program evaluation and other research efforts.

b. Who should lead the effort?

Response: PG&E recommends that a qualified independent expert evaluator lead the group with participation of qualified stakeholders. The evaluator should be jointly chosen by key stakeholders—particularly the IOUs and intervenor parties. If compensation is required for this leadership position, a funding source would have to be identified. The group should have a formalized structure and organization guided by a mission and charter. This structure should include governance and working committees dedicated to specific areas of expertise.

Group participants would represent a wide variety of disciplines and expertise including economists, engineers, social scientists, public and energy policy experts, environmentalists, marketers and others. In addition, the working group should represent a broad spectrum of the energy efficiency

community including regulatory staff, IOU representatives, evaluation professionals, ratepayer advocacy groups, professional trade organizations & environmental organizations and others.

c. What would be the group's relationship with the Commission?

Response: The group would act in a standing advisory capacity to the Commission and its staff, providing the Commission with recommendations regarding evaluation policy, best practices, and next steps. The group would remain an independent body and not in the employ of the Commission.

d. How should the Commission use the group's recommendations?

Response: The Commission should look to this advisory group as though it were an independent expert evaluation consultant. In that capacity, the group would assist the Commission through advising on the development of evaluation policies, evaluation methodologies, and findings that the CPUC can use in formulating policy and other evaluation-related decisions. A stakeholder group of IOUs and other parties would review the milestones and progress updates throughout the process. The Commission should give strong consideration to the recommendations presented by this group as those recommendations will be based on input by a broad coalition of stakeholders and industry experts.

Question. 4.4: Experimental Design

A. D.10-04-029 adopted a policy to measure and count savings from "comparative usage programs" using experimental design. OPower suggests that there may be an expanded role for experimental design in California's energy efficiency evaluation framework. OPower admits that experimental design cannot be used for every energy efficiency initiative, but argues that it should be the preferred initiative when practical.

a. Could and should experimental design be practically applied to energy efficiency initiatives beyond comparative usage programs?

Response: The role of experimental design beyond comparative usage programs is limited. Experimental design is an approach to quantifying the impact of particular "treatments" but has these three core requirements:

1. Independent “treatment” and “control” groups can be randomly selected from the population of interest.
2. “Treatment” and “control” groups must be large enough so that the design provides sufficient statistical power to detect the effects of the treatment on the population of interest.
3. “Treatment” and “control” groups must be randomly selected from a single population.

These three core requirements are seldom found in reality. That is why over the past three decades a variety of alternative evaluation methods have been developed in this arena. PG&E believes this issue could be worthy of further discussion and recommends that the Commission host a workshop at which OPOWER and others can present perspectives on this issue.

b. Would experimental design be an appropriate methodology to measure the impact of each of the 12 statewide programs approved in D.09-09-047? Please delineate between the subsets of each statewide program as necessary, and indicate which subset would be well served by experimental design.

Response: For the reasons discussed in subpart (a) of this question, PG&E believes it is not likely that experimental design can be used outside of a select few areas of the portfolio. This method might be applicable to parts of the Residential and/or Marketing Outreach and Education programs.

Question 4.5: Market Transformation

A. D.09-09-047 directed the Commission’s Energy Division to develop market transformation metrics, a process which is currently underway. Most parties agree that the Commission needs to do more to measure progress in achieving market transformation. Do parties agree with DRA’s suggestion that the Commission should adopt market transformation metrics already developed by the NEEA?

Response: PG&E received information from NEEA on Thursday, July 15, 2010 and has not yet had an opportunity to review the specific NEEA metrics. Therefore, PG&E cannot opine as to whether they are applicable to the complex market dynamics we face in California. PG&E recommends that the Commission host a workshop where NEEA representatives can present the

metrics to stakeholders who then have the opportunity to discuss how those metrics align with California's energy efficiency scheme. Wholesale adoption of a set of metrics would be premature prior to such a discussion taking place. That said, PG&E is reviewing the materials recently received from NEEA and reserves the right to comment more specifically in its July 23, 2010 reply comments.

a. Are there available best practices from NEEA that should be adopted by California? Please be specific.

Response: See response to Question 4.5A.

b. What would be the primary challenges in adopting market transformation metrics from NEEA? What strategies could be applied to overcome such challenges?

Response: See response to Question 4.5A. Adopting such metrics would require ensuring that they are applicable to the California market context and the types of interventions being carried out here. This question should be presented and discussed at a workshop attended by NEEA representatives and interested stakeholders.

Question 4.6: EM&V Needs and Activities of the CEC

A. D.08-07-047 sets interim energy efficiency savings goals for 2012 through 2020 for electricity and natural gas on a Total Market Gross (TMG) basis. The TMG goals encompass forecasted energy savings from a wide range of energy efficiency activities beyond investor-owned utility (IOU) programs. Can existing EM&V practices adequately determine the impact of energy efficiency initiatives beyond the Commission's energy efficiency programs (i.e., compliance with codes and standards)? If not, should this capability be added and how?

Response: Current EM&V practices focus mainly on evaluation of the gross energy savings generated by the IOUs' programs, as well as the percentage of those savings purportedly attributable to the IOUs' programs based on free-ridership estimates (i.e. discounting the net effect of IOUs' programs due to the positive evolution of markets). The focus of EM&V is not on the impact of other initiatives beyond the Commission's programs.

It is not clear whether evaluation of programs beyond the CPUC programs is an appropriate role for EM&V. Significant issues still remain with respect to evaluation of the programs under the Commission's jurisdiction that should be resolved before the scope of EM&V is expanded further. In

addition, representatives of other initiatives beyond the CPUC's energy efficiency programs should be heard on these issues so an appropriate evaluation scheme can be developed should the Commission determine that it is appropriate to do so.

a. If the Commission's EM&V should measure energy efficiency initiatives beyond its own programs, how should such activities be coordinated with the CEC?

Response: Some coordination already exists for EM&V projects such as Residential Appliance Saturation Study, Commercial End Use Survey, Industrial End Use Survey, and Demand Forecast Energy Efficiency Quantification Working Group. Most importantly, the Commission should allow the CEC to engage in this discussion and solicit its recommendations as to how best to coordinate efforts before any final decision on this issue is adopted.

B. Parties note that EM&V impact evaluations, as well as other parts of the current EM&V framework need to provide support for long-term demand forecasts, such as those prepared by the CEC, and used in the Commission's long-term procurement planning. Should IOUs be directed, and funded through EM&V, to develop disaggregated demand forecasting models that more directly allow energy efficiency program impacts to be included in long-term forecast models?

Response: No, the IOUs should not be directed and funded through EM&V to develop such models. Rather, the Commission should coordinate with other agencies that are already involved with such forecasts (CEC, CPUC, and ISO) and encourage and fund IOU staff to support, analyze, and play a critical role in models these agencies develop. This would leverage existing efforts by these other agencies and broaden the level of stakeholder input in developing such forecasts.

a. Are there additional analytical efforts which could be undertaken to better support the integration of projected energy savings into California's demand forecasts?

Response: As discussed in response to Question 4.6B, coordination between the IOUs' energy efficiency staff and other agencies that develop these forecasts would further this goal. Such coordination would help ensure a common understanding of the appropriate assumptions to be used in the forecast that best reflect the energy efficiency landscape.

III. CONCLUSION

PG&E appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments. PG&E reiterates its recommendation that prior to adopting specific technical and/or policy-oriented reforms, the Commission (1) hire a contractor to conduct a comprehensive review of EM&V institutions and frameworks; (2) set the structure for the 2013-15 energy efficiency programs including issues of cost-effectiveness, goal setting and coordination with the incentive proceeding, and determine if the Strategic Plan will be updated; and (3) engage a broad coalition of interested stakeholders in a workshop-style process to discuss policy and technical issues and make further recommendations to the Commission in light of the decisions made with respect to the 2013-15 programs.

Respectfully submitted,

LISE H. JORDAN
MICHAEL R. KLOTZ

By: _____/s/
MICHAEL R. KLOTZ

Law Department
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
P. O. Box 7442
77 Beale Street, MSB30A
San Francisco, CA 94120
Telephone: (415) 973-7565
Facsimile: (415) 973-0516
E-Mail: mlke@pge.com

Attorneys for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: July 16, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

I, the undersigned, state that I am a citizen of the United States and am employed in the City and County of San Francisco; that I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the within cause; and that my business address is 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, California 94105.

I am readily familiar with the business practice of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In the ordinary course of business, correspondence is deposited with the United States Postal Service the same day it is submitted for mailing.

On July 16, 2010, I served a true copy of:

**COMMENTS OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 39 M) TO
ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S RULING**

[XX] By Electronic Mail – serving the enclosed via e-mail transmission to each of the parties listed on the official service list for **R.09-11-014** with an email address.

[XX] By U.S. Mail – by placing the enclosed for collection and mailing, in the course of ordinary business practice, with other correspondence of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, enclosed in a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, addressed to those parties listed on the official service list for **R.09-11-014** without an e-mail address.

I certify and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in San Francisco, California on July 16, 2010.

/s/

ANNABEL STRIPLIN

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

Total number of addressees: 111

CASE COORDINATION
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., PO BOX 770000 MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
Email: RegRelCPUCcases@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

ROGER GOLDSTEIN
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
245 MARKET ST, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
Email: rfg2@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

SANDY LAWRIE ENERGY PROCEEDINGS
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
Email: slda@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

JONATHAN D. PENDLETON ATTORNEY
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
Email: j1pc@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

LAUREN ROHDE
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
Email: LDRi@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

Simon Baker
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: seb@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Jordana Cammarata
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: jnc@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

JENNY GLUZGOLD
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.
77 BEALE ST, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
Email: yxg4@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

LISE JORDAN
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
Email: lhj2@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

CHONDA J. NWAMU ATTORNEY
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
FOR: Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Email: cjn3@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

SHILPA RAMAIYA
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
77 BEALE ST, MAIL CODE N3A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
Email: SRRd@pge.com
Status: INFORMATION

MICHAEL R. KLOTZ
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST, MS B30A, RM 3105B
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
FOR: Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Email: M1ke@pge.com
Status: PARTY

Carmen Best
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: cbe@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Jeanne Clinton
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4008
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: cln@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

Total number of addressees: 111

Cheryl Cox
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS
BRANCH
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4209
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: cxc@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Darwin Farrar
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5041
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: edf@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Peter Franzese
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: pcf@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Katherine Hardy
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: keh@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Jean A. Lamming
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: jl2@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Ayat E. Osman
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: aeo@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Anne W. Premo
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
770 L ST, STE 1050
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
Email: awp@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Tim G. Drew
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: zap@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Cathleen A. Fogel
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: cf1@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Mikhail Haramati
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: mkh@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Peter Lai
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
320 WEST 4TH ST STE 500
LOS ANGELES CA 90013
Email: ppl@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Kim Mahoney
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS
BRANCH
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4104
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: kmb@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Lisa Paulo
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: lp1@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Kristina Skierka
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: ks3@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

Total number of addressees: 111

George S. Tagnipes
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: jst@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

MATTHEW TISDALE
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
4104
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 0
Email: MWT@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Michael Wheeler
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5206
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: mmw@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

NATARA FELLER
BLANK ROME LLP
THE CHRYSLER BUILDING
405 LEXINGTON AVE
NEW YORK NY 10174-0208
Email: nfeller@BlankRome.com
Status: INFORMATION

CHRISTOPHER A. LEWIS
BLANK ROME LLP
ONE LOGAN SQUIRE 130 NORTH 18TH ST
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103-6998
Email: Lewis@BlankRome.com
Status: INFORMATION

STEVEN R. SCHILLER
CA ENERGY EFFICIENCY INDUSTRY COUNCIL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 0
Email: sschiller@efficiencycouncil.org
Status: INFORMATION

MICHAEL O'KEEFE
CAL. ENERGY EFFICIENCY INDUSTRY COUNCIL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000-0000
Email: mokeefe@efficiencycouncil.org
Status: INFORMATION

Zenaida G. Tapawan-Conway
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: ztc@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Pamela Wellner
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
Email: pw1@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE

GERALD LAHR
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS
101 8TH ST, PO BOX 2050
OAKLAND CA 94607
FOR: Association of Bay Area Governments
Email: jerry1@abag.ca.gov
Status: PARTY

PETER F. JAZAYERI
BLANK ROME LLP
1925 CENTURY PARK, EAST STE 1900
LOS ANGELES CA 90067
Email: Jazayeri@BlankRome.com
Status: INFORMATION

AUDREY CHANG
CA ENERGY EFFICIENCY INDUSTRY COUNCIL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 0
Email: achang@efficiencycouncil.org
Status: INFORMATION

CHRIS ANN DICKERSON
CAD CONSULTING
720B CANYON OAKS DRIVE
OAKLAND CA 94605
Email: cadickerson@cadconsulting.biz
Status: INFORMATION

IRENE M. STILLINGS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CALIF. CNTR FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVE., STE 100
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
Email: irene.stillings@energycenter.org
Status: INFORMATION

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

Total number of addressees: 111

ROBERT L. KNIGHT
CAL. BLDG. PERFORMANCE CONTRATORS ASSN.
1000 BROADWAY, STE 410
OAKLAND CA 94607
FOR: California Building Performance Contractors
Association
Email: rknight@bki.com
Status: PARTY

JENNIFER GREEN
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVE
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
Email: jennifer.green@energycenter.org
Status: INFORMATION

ASHLEY WATKINS
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVE. STE 100
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
Email: ashley.watkins@energycenter.org
Status: INFORMATION

SYLVIA BENDER
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH ST, MS20
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
Email: sbender@energy.state.ca.us
Status: STATE-SERVICE

CHRIS KAVALEC
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH ST
SACRAMENTO CA 95831
Email: ckavalec@energy.state.ca.us
Status: STATE-SERVICE

PETER CANESSA
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
1211 CHAPARRAL CIRCLE
SAN LUIS OBISPO CA 93401
Email: pcanessa@charter.net
Status: INFORMATION

CAL BROOMHEAD DEPT OF ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY
SECTION
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
11 GROVE ST
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
Email: cal.broomhead@sfgov.org
Status: INFORMATION

ANDREW MCALLISTER
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVE, STE 100
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
FOR: California Center For Sustainable Energy
Email: andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org
Status: PARTY

SEPHRA A. NINOW
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVE, STE 100
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
Email: sephra.ninow@energycenter.org
Status: INFORMATION

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
425 DIVISADERO ST., STE 303
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94117
Email: cem@newsdata.com
Status: INFORMATION

BILL JUNKER
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH ST, MS 22
SACRAMENTO CA 95819
Email: bjunker@energy.state.ca.us
Status: STATE-SERVICE

DON SCHULTZ
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH ST
SACRAMENTO CA 95819
Email: dschultz@energy.state.ca.us
Status: STATE-SERVICE

SARA STECK MYERS ATTORNEY
122 28TH AVE.
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121
FOR: Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable
Technologies
Email: ssmyers@att.net
Status: PARTY

DENNIS J. HERRERA
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CITY HALL, RM 234
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
Status: INFORMATION

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

Total number of addressees: 111

ANN KELLY DEPT. OF THE ENVIRONMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
11 GROVE ST
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
Email: ann.kelly@sfgov.org
Status: INFORMATION

SHAWN THOMPSON
CITY OF IRVINE
1 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA
IRVINE CA 92646
Email: sthompson@ci.irvine.ca.us
Status: INFORMATION

MARY TUCKER
CITY OF SAN JOSE, ENVIRONMENTAL SRVC DEP
200 EAST SANTA CLARA ST., 10TH FLR.
SAN JOSE CA 95113-1905
Email: mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov
Status: INFORMATION

JEANNE M. SOLE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CITY HALL, RM 234
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLET PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4682
FOR: Ckty and County of San Francisco
Email: jeanne.sole@sfgov.org
Status: PARTY

Diana L. Lee
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4107
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214
FOR: DRA
Email: dil@cpuc.ca.gov
Status: PARTY

LYNN HAUG
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
2600 CAPITAL AVE, STE 400
SACRAMENTO CA 95816
Email: lmh@eslawfirm.com
Status: INFORMATION

CYNTHIA MITCHELL
ENERGY ECONOMICS, INC.
530 COLGATE COURT
RENO NV 89503
Email: ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net
Status: INFORMATION

THERESA L. MUELLER ATTORNEY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4682
Email: theresa.mueller@sfgov.org
Status: INFORMATION

SHAYNA H. HIRSHFIELD
CITY OF SAN JOSE-ENVIRONMENTAL SVCS DEP
200 EAST SANTA CLARA
SAN JOSE CA 95113
Email: Shayna.Hirshfield@sanjoseca.gov
Status: INFORMATION

SUSAN MUNVES ENERGY AND GREEN BLDG. PROG.
ADMIN.
CITY OF SANTA MONICA
1212 5TH ST, FIRST FLR
SANTA MONICA CA 90401
Email: susan.munves@smgov.net
Status: INFORMATION

DON LIDDELL
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
2928 2ND AVE
SAN DIEGO CA 92103
Email: liddell@energyattorney.com
Status: INFORMATION

ANDREW B. BROWN
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, L.L.P.
2600 CAPITOL AVE, STE 400
SACRAMENTO CA 95816-5905
Email: abb@eslawfirm.com
Status: INFORMATION

REUBEN DEUMLING
ENERGY ECONOMICS INC.
3309 SE MAIN ST
PORTLAND OR 97214
Email: 9watts@gmail.com
Status: INFORMATION

MONA TIERNEY-LLOYD SENIOR MANAGER WESTERN
REG. AFFAIRS
ENERNOC, INC.
PO BOX 378
CAYUCOS CA 93430
FOR: EnerNoc, Inc.
Email: mtierney-lloyd@enernoc.com
Status: PARTY

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

Total number of addressees: 111

MIKE JASKE
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000-0000
Email: Mjaske@energy.state.ca.us
Status: STATE-SERVICE

THOMAS P. CONLON PRESIDENT
GEOPRAXIS
PO BOX 5
SONOMA CA 95476-0005
FOR: GeoPraxis, Inc.
Email: tconlon@geopraxis.com
Status: PARTY

ERIC LEE
HARPIRIS ENERGY, LLC
25205 BARONET ROAD
CORRAL DE TIERRA CA 93908
FOR: Harpiris Energy
Email: eric@harpiris.com
Status: PARTY

JEFF HIRSCH
JAMES J. HIRSCH & ASSOCIATES
12185 PRESILLA ROAD
CAMARILLO CA 93012-9243
Email: Jeff.Hirsch@DOE2.com
Status: INFORMATION

ED VINE
LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY
BUILDING 90-400
BERKELEY CA 94720-8136
Email: ELVine@lbl.gov
Status: INFORMATION

G. PATRICK STONER PROGRAM DIRECTOR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000-0000
Email: pstoner@lgc.org
Status: INFORMATION

JODY LONDON
JODY LONDON CONSULTING
PO BOX 3629
OAKLAND CA 94609
FOR: Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition
Email: jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net
Status: PARTY

ELIZEBETH RASMUSSEN
MARIN ENERGY AUTHORITY
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE, RM. 308
SAN RAFAEL CA 94903
FOR: Marin Energy Authority
Email: erasmussen@co.marin.ca.us
Status: PARTY

MRW & ASSOCIATES, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 0
Email: mrw@mrwassoc.com
Status: INFORMATION

DONALD GILLIGAN
NATIONAL ASSC. OF ENERGY SVC. COMPANIES
1615 M ST, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20036
FOR: National Association of Energy Services Companies
Email: dgilligan@naesco.org
Status: PARTY

LARA ETTENSON
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER ST, 20TH FLR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
FOR: Natural Resources Defense Council
Email: lettenson@nrdc.org
Status: PARTY

MAX BAUMHEFNER LEGAL FELLOW
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER ST., 20TH FLR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
Email: mbaumhefner@nrdc.org
Status: INFORMATION

NOAH LONG
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER ST, 20TH FLR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
Email: nlong@nrdc.org
Status: INFORMATION

PETER MILLER
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER ST, 20TH FLR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
Email: pmiller@nrdc.org
Status: INFORMATION

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

Total number of addressees: 111

JENNIFER BARNES
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000-0000
Email: Jennifer.Barnes@Navigantconsulting.com
Status: INFORMATION

BRAD KATES
OPINION DYNAMICS CORPORATION
230 THIRD FLR
WALTHAM MA 2451
Email: bkates@opiniondynamics.com
Status: INFORMATION

MARY SUTTER
OPINION DYNAMICS CORPORATION
2415 ROOSEVELT DRIVE
ALAMEDA CA 94501
Email: msutter@opiniondynamics.com
Status: INFORMATION

MICHAEL SACHSE
OPOWER
1515 N. COURTHOUSE RD., STE 610
ARLINGTON VA 22201
FOR: OPower
Email: michael.sachse@opower.com
Status: PARTY

BRENDA HOPEWELL
PORTLAND ENERGY CONSERVATION, INC.
1400 SW 5TH AVE, STE 700
PORTLAND OR 97201
Email: bhopewell@peci.org
Status: INFORMATION

PUJA DEVERAKONDA
POSITIVE ENERGY
1911 FORT MYER DRIVE
ARLINGTON VA 22209
Email: puja@opower.com
Status: INFORMATION

STEVEN D. PATRICK
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 WEST FIFTH ST, GT14G1
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1011
FOR: San Diego Gas & Electric/SoCal Gas
Email: SDPatrick@SempraUtilities.com
Status: PARTY

ATHENA BESA
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 0
Email: ABesa@SempraUtilities.com
Status: INFORMATION

JOY C. YAMAGATA
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC/SOCALGAS
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP 32 D
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1530
Email: JYamagata@SempraUtilities.com
Status: INFORMATION

THERESA BURKE
SAN FRANCISCO PUC
1155 MARKET ST, 4TH FLR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103
Email: tburke@sfgwater.org
Status: INFORMATION

SCOTT BLAISING
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN, P.C.
915 L ST, STE 1270
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
FOR: San Joaquin Valley Power Authority
Email: blaising@braunlegal.com
Status: PARTY

MICHAEL ROCHMAN MANAGING DIRECTOR
SCHOOL PROJECT UTILITY RATE REDUCTION
1430 WILLOW PASS ROAD, STE 240
CONCORD CA 94520
Email: service@spurr.org
Status: INFORMATION

PEDRO VILLEGAS
SEMPRA ENERGY UTILITIES
601 VAN NESS AVE, STE 2060
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
Email: PVillegas@SempraUtilities.com
Status: INFORMATION

JACKI BACHARACH EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
5033 ROCKVALLEY ROAD
RANCHO PALOS VERDES CA 90275
Email: sbccog@southbaycities.org
Status: INFORMATION

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

Total number of addressees: 111

MARILYN LYON SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
SOUTH BAY ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CTR.
15901 HAWTHORNE BLVD., STE. 400
LAWNDALE CA 90260-2656
Email: marilyn@sbesc.com
Status: INFORMATION

LARRY COPE
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WLNUT GROVE AVE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
FOR: Southern California Edison
Email: larry.cope@sce.com
Status: PARTY

SAMUEL S. KANG
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE, SECOND FLR
BERKELEY CA 94704
FOR: The Greenlining Institute
Email: samuelk@greenlining.org
Status: PARTY

ENRIQUE GALLARDO
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FLR
BERKELEY CA 94704
Email: enriqueg@greenlining.org
Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT FINKELSTEIN
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
115 SANSOME ST, STE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
FOR: TURN
Email: bfinkelstein@turn.org
Status: PARTY

MEGAN MYERS
VASQUEZ ESTRADA & DUMONT LLP
1000 FOURTH ST, STE 700
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901
Email: mmyers@vandelaw.com
Status: INFORMATION

BARBARA GEORGE
WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS
PO BOX 548
FAIRFAX CA 94978-0548
FOR: Women's Energy Matters
Email: wem@igc.org
Status: PARTY

JENNIFER M. TSAO SHIGEKAWA
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
Email: Jennifer.Shigekawa@sce.com
Status: INFORMATION

RAFI HASSAN
SUSQUEHANNA FINANCIAL GROUP, LLLP
101 CALIFORNIA ST, STE 3250
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
Email: rafi.hassan@sig.com
Status: INFORMATION

STEPHANIE C. CHEN
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY CA 0
Email: stephaniec@greenlining.org
Status: INFORMATION

MARYBELLE C. ANG
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
115 SANSOME ST, STE. 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
Email: mang@turn.org
Status: INFORMATION

CRAIG TYLER
TYLER & ASSOCIATES
2760 SHASTA ROAD
BERKELEY CA 94708
Email: craigtyler@comcast.net
Status: INFORMATION

CHERYL COLLART
VENTURA COUNTY REGIONAL ENERGY ALLIANCE
1000 SOUTH HILL ROAD, STE. 230
VENTURA CA 93003
Email: cheryl.collart@ventura.org
Status: INFORMATION

**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EMAIL SERVICE LIST**

Last Updated: July 7, 2010

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0911014

9watts@gmail.com;abb@eslawfirm.com;ABesa@SempraUtilities.com;achang@efficiencycouncil.org;aeo@cpuc.ca.gov;andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org;ann.kelly@sfgov.org;ashley.watkins@energycenter.org;awp@cpuc.ca.gov;bfinkelstein@turn.org;bhopewell@peci.org;bjunker@energy.state.ca.us;bkates@opiniondynamics.com;blaising@braunlegal.com;cadickerson@cadconsulting.biz;cal.broomhead@sfgov.org;cbe@cpuc.ca.gov;cem@newsdata.com;cf1@cpuc.ca.gov;cheryl.collart@ventura.org;cjn3@pge.com;ckavalec@energy.state.ca.us;ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net;cln@cpuc.ca.gov;craigtyler@comcast.net;cxc@cpuc.ca.gov;dgilligan@naesco.org;dil@cpuc.ca.gov;dschultz@energy.state.ca.us;edf@cpuc.ca.gov;ELVine@lbl.gov;enriqueg@greenlining.org;erasmussen@co.marin.ca.us;eric@harpiris.com;irene.stillings@energycenter.org;j1pc@pge.com;Jazayeri@BlankRome.com;jeanne.sole@sfgov.org;Jeff.Hirsch@DOE2.com;Jennifer.Barnes@Navigantconsulting.com;jennifer.green@energycenter.org;Jennifer.Shigekawa@sce.com;jerry@abag.ca.gov;jl2@cpuc.ca.gov;jnc@cpuc.ca.gov;jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net;jst@cpuc.ca.gov;JYamagata@SempraUtilities.com;keh@cpuc.ca.gov;kmb@cpuc.ca.gov;ks3@cpuc.ca.gov;larry.cope@sce.com;LDRi@pge.com;lettenson@nrdc.org;Lewis@BlankRome.com;lhj2@pge.com;liddell@energyattorney.com;lmh@eslawfirm.com;lp1@cpuc.ca.gov;M1ke@pge.com;mang@turn.org;marilyn@sbesc.com;mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov;mbaumhefner@nrdc.org;michael.sachse@opower.com;Mjaske@energy.state.ca.us;mkh@cpuc.ca.gov;mmw@cpuc.ca.gov;mmyers@vandelaw.com;mokeefe@efficiencycouncil.org;mrw@mrwassoc.com;msutter@opiniondynamics.com;mtierney-lloyd@enernoc.com;MWT@cpuc.ca.gov;nfeller@BlankRome.com;nlong@nrdc.org;pcanessa@charter.net;pcf@cpuc.ca.gov;pmiller@nrdc.org;ppl@cpuc.ca.gov;pstoner@lgc.org;puja@opower.com;PVillegas@SempraUtilities.com;pw1@cpuc.ca.gov;rafi.hassan@sig.com;RegRelCPUCcases@pge.com;rfg2@pge.com;rknight@bki.com;samuelk@greenlining.org;sbccog@southbaycities.org;sbender@energy.state.ca.us;SDPatrick@SempraUtilities.com;seb@cpuc.ca.gov;sephra.ninow@energycenter.org;service@spurr.org;Shayna.Hirshfield@sanjoseca.gov;slida@pge.com;SRRd@pge.com;sschiller@efficiencycouncil.org;ssmyers@att.net;stephaniec@greenlining.org;sthompson@ci.irvine.ca.us;susan.munves@smgov.net;tburke@sfwater.org;tconlon@geopraxis.com;theresa.mueller@sfgov.org;wem@igc.org;yxg4@pge.com;zap@cpuc.ca.gov;ztc@cpuc.ca.gov;