

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of PACIFIC GAS AND
ELECTRIC COMPANY (U-39-E) for
Authority to Increase Revenue
Requirements to Recover the Costs to
Upgrade its SmartMeter™ Program

Application No. 07-12-009
(Filed December 12, 2007)

**RESPONSE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO THE
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S SEPTEMBER 22, 2010 RULING**

I. INTRODUCTION

On September 22, 2010, the Assigned Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) issued a ruling denying the City’s motion for expedited treatment, and asking the parties to comment on what further steps should be taken.¹ The ALJ’s ruling arises from the City’s Petition to Modify D.09-03-026 to Temporarily Suspend Pacific Gas & Electric Company’s (“PG&E”) Installation of SmartMeters filed on June 18, 2010 (“Petition”).

In the Petition, the City asked the Commission to take the modest step of temporarily suspending SmartMeter installations until the time the Commission completed its investigation into SmartMeters. The Petition arose from the large number of customer complaints and general dissatisfaction with PG&E’s SmartMeter deployment, the pending investigation into PG&E’s deployment, and the fact that PG&E anticipated installing SmartMeters in San Francisco starting on July 1, 2010. The City was not alone in expressing concern over PG&E’s rollout of SmartMeters.²

¹ Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling of September 22, 2010 (“ALJ’s Ruling”) at p. 9.

²The Utility Reform Network (“TURN”), the City of Santa Cruz, the County of Santa Cruz, the Town of Fairfax, the City of Capitola, the City of Monte Sereno and the City of Scotts Valley all supported the City’s petition; the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (“DRA”) filed a response which acknowledged the seriousness of the problem with PG&E’s efforts. In addition, two parties filed separate applications related to PG&E’s

The City appreciates the opportunity to comment on the issue identified by the ALJ. Although the specific relief sought in the City’s Petition is no longer available, the Commission has a continuing obligation to ensure that ratepayers receive “adequate, efficient, just and reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment and facilities.”³ The Commission can satisfy this mandate in two ways.

First, before adopting the methodology and findings in the report, the Commission should seek comment on and evaluate the Structure Group’s report, just as it would any other proffered report. Second, the Commission should prevent PG&E from increasing ratepayer costs associated with PG&E’s SmartMeter rollout absent compelling evidence that these additional costs could not have been avoided.

II. DISCUSSION

A. The Commission Should Use this Proceeding To Review the Structure Group Report.

The Commission cannot reasonably rely on the findings in the report unless it reviews the report, which would necessarily include allowing interested parties to first file comments. This is consistent with the ALJ’s earlier determinations that (i) PG&E must provide cost data to parties and parties should have an opportunity to comment on the data,⁴ and (ii) the Structure Group report should be provided to all parties.

The Commission does not typically accept the findings presented in a report by any party – whether that party is a utility, a customer, an independent consultant, or even Commission staff – without first reviewing the report to determine what weight it should be given. This proceeding is the appropriate place for the Commission to engage in such

SmartMeters. *See* Application of Heather Epps for Modification of D.06-07-027 and D.09-03-26 (A.10-09-015); and Application of the EMF Safety Network for Modification (A.10-04-018). Also, the Town of Fairfax, the County of Santa Cruz and the City of Watsonville each passed moratoria banning the installation of SmartMeters.

³ Public Utilities Code § 451.

⁴ Prehearing Conference Transcript at 31:23-32:19.

a review, which should include, at least, comments from interested parties and findings from the Commission.

This has been the Commission's practice under many similar circumstances. When the Commission sought to audit the utilities' energy efficiency efforts, it directed the Energy Division to prepare a report evaluating the efficacy of the programs. The Energy Division issued a report in mid-April 2010, which questioned the cost-effectiveness of the energy efficiency programs. The Commission published the report in early May 2010 and solicited comments on the report from the parties to the energy efficiency rulemaking.⁵

In their comments, interested parties either contested or supported the assumptions and methodologies used in the Energy Division's scenario analysis. Based on these comments, the Commission sought further clarification and ordered the utilities to produce additional data supporting their arguments.⁶ The Commission has yet to vote on a final decision, as there are two decisions pending: the ALJ's proposed decision finding that no further incentive payments are warranted, and Commissioner Bohn's alternate decision awarding \$77.3 million in incentive payments. Clearly, each proposed decision assigns a different evidentiary weight to the Energy Division's report, a fact that demonstrates that different conclusions may be reached from the same report.⁷

⁵ Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Providing Energy Division Report and Soliciting Comments on Scenario Runs issued May 4, 2010, at p. 2, *Order Instituting Rulemaking to Examine Commission's Energy Efficiency Risk/Reward Mechanisms* (R.09-01-019).

⁶ Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Directing Production of Supporting Data issued July 6, 2010, at p. 3, *Order Instituting Rulemaking to Examine Commission's Energy Efficiency Risk/Reward Mechanisms* (R.09-01-019).

⁷ The Commission used a similar process in R. 07-04-015, where the Commission prepared a report for the Legislature and determined how to proceed in light of that report. "Based on the comments received on the draft, the [Final Analysis Report] was revised and is included herein as Attachment A. This decision adopts the [Final Analysis Report] for transmittal to the Legislature and addresses the next steps the Commission should take." D.08-09-014 at p. 10, *Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion into Reliability Standards for Telecommunications Emergency Backup Power Systems and Emergency Notification Systems Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2393* (R.07-04-015).

In another instance, when PG&E sought to recover sunk costs associated with its Diablo Canyon facility, the Commission required an independent accounting firm to perform a financial verification audit of Diablo Canyon's plant accounts in order to ensure that the net book value amounts were independently established.⁸ However, before the Commission accepted the results of the independent audit, the Commission required the audit to be served on all parties to the proceeding, and ensured that the parties had an opportunity to respond to the audit report.⁹ Similarly, in the realm of resource adequacy requirements, before the Commission adopted the Load Capacity Requirements ("LCR") for load serving entities for 2007, it provided interested parties with an extensive opportunity to review and comment on the California Independent System Operator's LCR report.¹⁰ The Commission ultimately relied on much of the report, but did so subject to conditions and specified changes to the methodology for future years.¹¹ In these instances, and many others, the Commission recognized that it would benefit from having parties comment on a report before the Commission determined how to use the findings contained in that report.

Likewise, the Commission should provide opportunity for parties to comment on the Structure Group report in this proceeding as part of its determination of how to use the report. The Structure Group report is lengthy, convoluted and far from a ringing endorsement of PG&E's SmartMeter deployment. Furthermore, DRA already asked the Commission to hold this proceeding open to allow the parties to address the results of the investigation.¹² In addition, the City anticipates that the Commission itself may have

⁸ D.00-09-008, at p. 2, *Application to Modify Diablo Canyon Pricing and Adopt a Customer Electric Rate Freeze in Compliance with D.95-12-063* (A.96-03-054).

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ See D. 06-06-064 Opinion on Local Resource Adequacy Requirements, at pgs. 2-3, *Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider Refinements to and Further Development of the Commission's Resource Adequacy Requirements Program* (R.05-12-013). See also pgs. 8, 13-14 for a description of the iterative process that led to the final LCR study.

¹¹ *Id.* at Ordering Paragraph 3 and p. 3.

¹² DRA Prehearing Conference Statement, p. 5.

questions about the Structure Group report, given that the report makes recommendations for changes in the Commission's own practices.

B. The Commission Must Enforce the Reasonableness Requirement if PG&E Exceeds the \$100 Million the Commission Allowed for Cost Overruns.

The City supports DRA's position that the Commission must closely examine whether or not PG&E's SmartMeter deployment costs are reasonable in light of PG&E's history of problems.¹³ Despite PG&E's argument that the moratorium requested in the Petition would have been costly, the Commission might find that PG&E should have voluntarily ceased deployment, rather than continuing to deploy meters that had known problems. If that proves to be the case, the Commission should not allow PG&E to recover those costs from ratepayers.

In addition to concerns over the accuracy of PG&E's SmartMeters, the City's Petition arose out of concern that the practices and means chosen by PG&E to implement its SmartMeter program were contributing to customer complaints, as the Structure Group report noted. PG&E's chosen practices and protocols used in deploying SmartMeters are relevant to the question of whether the costs were reasonably incurred.

Although the Structure Group report states that the meters are accurate, the scope of the report did not address the historical meter accuracy or the fact that PG&E was required to replace its initially chosen firmware. These issues are among many identified in the City's Petition and relate directly to whether or not PG&E was reasonable in incurring additional expense.

¹³ See D.06-07-027 Conclusion of Law No. 5.

III. CONCLUSION

While the Structure Group's report is useful in that it identifies issues and provides potential explanations for PG&E's deployment problems, the Commission should undertake a proper review of the report before it relies on those findings. This will enable the Commission to create a robust record and provide the greatest opportunity for the Commission, other parties, and PG&E to learn from past mistakes. The Commission should also be vigilant in ensuring that PG&E's costs were actually reasonably incurred.

Dated: October 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney
THERESA L. MUELLER
Chief Energy and Telecommunications Deputy
WILLIAM K. SANDERS
AUSTIN YANG
Deputy City Attorneys

By: _____ /S/
AUSTIN M. YANG

Attorneys for Petitioner
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
City Hall Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102-4682
Telephone: (415) 554-6761
Facsimile: (415) 554-4757
E-Mail: austin.yang@sfgov.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, **PAULA FERNANDEZ**, declare that:

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is City Attorney's Office, City Hall, Room 234, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 554-4623.

On October 15, 2010, I served **RESPONSE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S SEPTEMBER 22, 2010 RULING** by electronic mail on the CPUC Service List, Proceeding No. A0712009.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on October 15, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/s/
PAULA FERNANDEZ



CPUC Home

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Service Lists

PROCEEDING: A0712009 - PG&E - TO INCREASE R
FILER: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
LIST NAME: LIST
LAST CHANGED: OCTOBER 5, 2010

DOWNLOAD THE COMMA-DELIMITED FILE
ABOUT COMMA-DELIMITED FILES

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

Parties

STEVEN D. PATRICK
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
 555 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 1400
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90013-1011
 FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

MARC JOSEPH
 ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
 601 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 1000
 SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
 FOR: COALITION OF CALIFORNIA UTILITY
 EMPLOYEES

WILLIAM SANDERS
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 CITY HALL, RM. 234
 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
 FOR: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

KAREN P. PAULL
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 LEGAL DIVISION
 ROOM 4300
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
 FOR: DRA

PAUL ANGELOPULO
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 LEGAL DIVISION
 ROOM 4107
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
 FOR: DIVISION OF RATEPAYER'S ADVOCATES

JIM R. KARPIAK
 TOWN OF FAIRFAX
 44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 3800
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
 FOR: TOWN OF FAIRFAX

NINA SUETAKE
 THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
 115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
 FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

EDWARD G. POOLE
 ANDERSON & POOLE
 601 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1300
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108-2812
 FOR: WESTERN MANUFACTURED HOUSING COOM.
 ASSOC.

BRIAN K. CHERRY
 VP - REGULATORY RELATIONS
 PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
 77 BEALE ST., MC B10C, PO BOX 770000
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

CHONDA J. NWAMU
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 77 BEALE STREET, B30A
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC

DAVID J. BYERS
 MCCracken & Byers, LLP
 1920 LESLIE STREET
 SAN MATEO, CA 94403-1325
 FOR: CALIFORNIA CITY-COUNTY STREET
 LIGHT ASSOCIATION

KRISTEN M. POWELL
 CITY OF MONTE SERENO
 18041 SARATOGA-LOS GATOS ROAD
 MONTE SERENO, CA 95030
 FOR: CITY OF MONTE SERENO

CELESTIAL S.D. CASSMAN
 ATCHISON BARISONE CONDOTTI & KOVACEVICH
 333 CHURCH STREET
 SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
 FOR: CITY OF CAPITOLA

DANA MCRAE
 COUNTY COUNSEL
 COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ
 701 OCEAN STREET, ROOM 505
 SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
 FOR: COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

JOHN G. BARISONE
 CITY ATTORNEY
 ATCHISON BARISONE CONDOTTI & KOVACEVICH
 333 OCEAN STREET
 SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
 FOR: CITY OF SANTA CRUZ

KRISTEN M. POWELL
 CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY
 ONE CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
 SCOTTS VALLEY, CA 95066
 FOR: CITY SCOTTS VALLEY

ALAN J. SMITH
 CITY OF WATSONVILLE
 240 WESTGATE DRIVE
 WATSONVILLE, CA 95067
 FOR: CITY OF WATSONVILLE

JIM HAWLEY
 VP, CALIFORNIA POLITICS& GENERAL COUNSEL
 TECHNET
 1215 K STREET, SUITE 1900
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
 FOR: TECHNET

Information Only

MRW & ASSOCIATES, LLC
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
 FOR: MRW & ASSOCIATES

JULIE DUMOULIN-SMITH
 ASSOCIATE ANALYST
 NATURAL GAS & ELECTRIC UTILITIES GROUP
 1285 AVE. OF THE AMERICAS
 NEW YORK, NY 10019

ADAR ZANGO
 ANALYST
 ZIMMER LUCAS PARTNERS
 535 MADISON - 6TH FLOOR
 NEW YORK, NY 10022
 FOR: ZIMMER LUCAS PARTNERS

R.W. BAIRD & CO.
 2525 WEST END AVE
 NASHVILLE, TN 37203

WILLIAM HARRISON
 ROBERT W. BAIRD
 777 E. WISCONSIN AVE
 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

RASHA PRINCE
 SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO
 555 WEST 5TH STREET, GT14D6
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

GREGORY KLATT

CASE ADMINISTRATION

ATTORNEY AT LAW
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
411 E. HUNTINGTON DR., NO. 107-356
ARCADIA, CA 91006

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

JANET S. COMBS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PO BOX 800
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

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

REBECCA W. GILES
SDG&E AND SOCALGAS
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530

ERIC P. DRESSELHUYS
SILVER SPRING NETWORKS
555 BROADWAY STREET
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

PATRICIA WYROD
SILVER SPRING NETWORKS
555 BROADWAY STREET
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

RACHAEL E. KOSS
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZA
601 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, SUITE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

AUSTIN M. YANG
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY, RM. 234
1 DR. CARLTON B. GODDLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
FOR: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DENNIS J. HERRERA
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
FOR: INTERVENORS, CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.

THERESA L. MUELLER
CHIEF ENERGY & TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEPUTY
SAN FRANCISCO CITY ATTORNEY
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682

SANDRA ROVETTI
REGULATORY AFFAIRS MANAGER
SAN FRANCISCO PUC
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

THERESA BURKE
SAN FRANCISCO PUC
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

ROBERT FINKELSTEIN
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

DIONNE ADAMS
OPERATION REVENUE REQUIREMENTS DEPT
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

KAREN FORSGARD
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., MC B8Q
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

LAUREN ROHDE
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

RONALD HELGENS
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
245 MARKET STREET, MC N12G
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

BENJAMIN J. KALLO
VP - CLEAN TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH
ROBERT W. BAIRD & CO.
101 CALIFORNIA ST., STE. 1350
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
425 DIVISADERO ST., SUITE 303
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

CLIFF GLEICHER
DIRECTOR - GENERAL LITIGATION
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., MC B30A, PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120

J. MICHAEL REIDENBACH
LAW DEPARTMENT
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.

SHIRLEY A. WOO
ATTORNEY AT LAW
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442, MC B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120-7442
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

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

ELAINE WONG
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MC B10B
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

STEVEN W. FRANK
LAW DEPARTMENT
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

CHRIS KING
CHIEF STRATEGY OFFICER
EMETER STRATEGIC CONSULTING
2215 BIDGEPOINTE PARKWAY, STE 300
SAN MATEO, CA 94404
FOR: EMETER

MICHAEL ROCHMAN
MANAGING DIRECTOR
SCHOOL PROJECT UTILITY RATE REDUCTION
1850 GATEWAY BLVD., STE. 235
CONCORD, CA 94520

REED V. SCHMIDT
BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES
1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE
BERKELEY, CA 94703-2714
FOR: CALIFORNIA CITY-COUNTY STREET
LIGHT ASSOCIATION

PATRICK J. FORKIN III, CPA
VP-CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT
DAYSTAR TECHNOLOGIES
2972 STENDER WAY
SANTA CLARA, CA 95054

JEFF FRANCETIC
BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
LANDIS+GYR, INC.
14891 LAGO DRIVE
RANCHO MURIETA, CA 95683

SANDI MAURER
EMF SAFETY NETWORK
PO BOX 1016
SEBASTOPOL, CA 95743

JESSICA PEREYDA
TECHNET
1215 K STREET, SUITE 1900
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: TECHNET (TECHNOLOGY NETWORK)

TIM VALDERRAMA
EXEC. DIR
TECHNOLOGY NETWORK
1215 L STREET, STE. 1900
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: TECHNET - TECHNOLOGY NETWORK

ROGER LEVY
LEVY AND ASSOCIATES
2805 HUNTINGTON ROAD
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864

BENJAMIN SCHUMAN
PACIFIC CREST SECURITIES
111 SW 5TH AVE, 42ND FLR
PORTLAND, OR 97204

State Service

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

ANDREW CAMPBELL
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 EXECUTIVE DIVISION
 ROOM 5203
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

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

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

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

CHRISTOPHER R VILLARREAL
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 POLICY & PLANNING DIVISION
 ROOM 5119
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JOE COMO
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 DRA - ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCH
 ROOM 4101
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
 FOR: DRA

KARL MEEUSEN
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 EXECUTIVE DIVISION
 ROOM 5217
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

LEE-WHEI TAN
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS BRA
 ROOM 4102
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MATTHEW DEAL
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 POLICY & PLANNING DIVISION
 ROOM 5119
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

RASHID A. RASHID
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 LEGAL DIVISION
 ROOM 4107
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

REBECCA TSAI-WEI LEE
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 ENERGY DIVISION
 AREA 4-A
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
 FOR: DRA

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

THOMAS ROBERTS
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS BRA
 ROOM 4104
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

WENDY AL-MUKDAD
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 ENERGY DIVISION

ROOM 2106
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TOP OF PAGE
BACK TO INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS