

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Services Effective on January 1, 2011	Application 09-12-020 (Filed December 21, 2009)
Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission’s Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Service, and Facilities of Pacific Gas and Electric Company	Investigation 10-07-027 (Filed July 29, 2010)

CLAIM AND DECISION ON REQUEST FOR INTERVENOR COMPENSATION

Claimant: Consumer Federation of California	For contribution to D. 11-05-018
Claimed (\$): 214,007. 50	Awarded (\$):
Assigned Commissioner: Peevey	Assigned ALJ: David K. Fukutome
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, and III of this Claim is true to my best knowledge, information and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Claim has been served this day upon all required persons (as set forth in the Certificate of Service attached as Attachment 1).	
Signature: /s/ Nicole A. Blake	
Date: July 07, 2011	Printed Name: Nicole A. Blake

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES (to be completed by Claimant except where indicated)

A. Brief Description of Decision:

This Decision, D.11-05-018, adopts a settlement agreement with modifications and clarifications that resolves all but one issue in PG &E’s test year 2011 general rate case (GRC). The remaining issue related to the ratemaking treatment for undepreciated plant balance associated with electric meters that are replaced by SmartMeters, that plant balance will be amortized over a six year period with the associated rate of return on the unamortized balance reduced to 6.3% to reflect the reduced

regulatory risk for the plant.

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	February 19, 2010	
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	March 22, 2011	
3. Date NOI Filed:	March 22, 2010	
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed? Yes, Assigned Commissioner Peevey's Ruling and Scoping Memo issued on March 05, 2010 set a date of March 22, 2010 as the deadline for parties to the proceeding to file NOIs.		
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	N/A	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	N/A	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D. 11-04-028	
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	08-12-009	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	May 13, 2009	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision	D. 11-05-018	
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	May 13, 2011	
15. File date of compensation request:	July 12, 2011	
16. Was the request for compensation timely? Yes		

C. Additional Comments on Part I (use line reference # as appropriate):

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION (to be completed by Claimant except where indicated)

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059) (For each contribution, support with specific reference to final or record.)

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p>1. <u>Quantifying cost savings</u>- From the the very beginning of the proceeding CFC recommended that PG&E should take not only added costs in the base year but should also factor in cost savings resulting from programs. CFC argued through out the proceeding in hearing and in comments that the value of improvements to PG&E’s services should be measured and used to offset the increased cost of improving service.</p>	<p>Order #37 in Decision 11- 05-018 at page; § 3.12(n) of Settlement Agreement: “In future general rate cases, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall not add a new type of cost to the revenue requirement without estimating and including in the revenue requirement the cost savings to be achieved by the new type of cost or an explanation of the reasons there will be no cost savings”</p>	
<p>2. <u>Balancing accounts</u>: CFC argued tirelessly both in comments and in evidentiary hearings and testimony that balancing accounts for PG&E rule 20A, major emergencies, healthcare, RD&D, renewable generation are inappropriate as a the purpose of a balancing account is to show a certain cost is so substantial that it deprives the utility of an opportunity to earn a fair return. CFC argued that the costs PG&E proposed for balancing account treatment do not satisfy the Commission’s standard and is against regulatory policy.</p>	<p>Order #30 in D. 11-05-018 at page: “Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s requests for new balancing accounts for health care costs; New Business/Work at the Request of Others/Rule 20A; renewable energy projects; uncollectibles; emergencies and catastrophic events; and research development and demonstration expenses are denied. Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall continue with current electric and gas sales mechanism balancing accounts (Distribution Revenue Adjustment Mechanism, Utility Generation</p>	

<p>CFC (and Aglet) also argued that balancing accounts would inappropriately shelter costs from GRC-level scrutiny.</p> <p>The Commission adopted CFC's recommendation to deny new balancing accounts for the abovementioned costs.</p>	<p>Balancing Account, Core Fixed Cost Account, and Noncore Distribution Fixed Cost Account) through 2013.”</p> <p>Ex. CFC-1, pp. 27-33.</p>	
<p>3. <u>Transferring PG&E corporation employess to the Utility:</u></p> <p>CFC argued against the transfer of 183 employees using the Commission's affiliate transaction rules stating that “A utility, its parent holding company, and its affiliates shall be separate corporate.” CFC further argued against PG& E receiving funding for the transfer of PG&E corporation employees to the Utility.</p>	<p>D.11-05-018 at 12.; Tr. Vol. 22, 2691:20-22, CFC/Wodtke.; Settlement Agreement § 3.6.2(d)</p> <p>Order #27/Settlement Agreement at page 1-13: “During the term of this 2011 test year general rate case cycle, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall not accept a permanent transfer of an employee from an affiliate (including Pacific Gas and Electric Company Corporation) unless A.09-12-020, I.10-07-027 COM/MP1/hkr/oma Pacific Gas and Electric Company is able to demonstrate that there was a need for that employee, that the employee was fully qualified for the position compared to other persons (including non-employees) that may be reasonably available to Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and that the compensation to be paid the employee is within market range. Prior to any such transfer, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall memorialize its assessment of need and qualifications, including whether Pacific Gas and Electric Company interviewed other candidates to fill the position. To the extent that costs associated with such transfer of employees are sought in the next general rate case, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall make its assessments available to interested parties in the next general rate case.</p>	

	<p>“Given the positions taken by intervenors, the resolution of these issues as described above is supported by the record. Specifically, the Agreement balances CFC’s concerns about employee transfers from PG&E Corporation to the Utility, with PG&E’s management discretion to adjust its organizational structure without undue and costly procedural hurdles. In light of the various compromises set forth in the Agreement, the resolution of these issues as described above is reasonable and in the public interest.” Motion to Adopt Settlement Agreement at 68.</p>	
<p>4. <u>DIMP</u> CFC argued that PG&E should have included estimated cost savings in its adjustment to offset PG&E’s forecasted DIMP expenditures. The Commission incorporated CFC’s recommendation through the Settlement Agreement.</p>	<p>1. CFC-1, p. 16, line 20 to p. 17, line 7; Ex. CFC-29, p. 16 line 11 to p. 17, line 5.</p> <p>2. Settlement agreement at 1-6 § 3.3.2.</p> <p>3. Motion to adopt Settlement Agreement at 39: “Section 3.3 of the Agreement requires that PG&E create a MWC for its DIMP, with a one-way balancing account mechanism set at \$60 million for DIMP costs for the term of the GRC cycle (2011-2013). Any net unspent DIMP funds at the end of this GRC cycle would be returned to customers in the next GRC. The types of work this funding would cover include development and improvements in the following areas: DIMP program, preventive maintenance, leak surveys, operator qualifications, training and programs such as cross-bored sewer, marker ball</p>	

	<p>installation, and Aldyl-A. Given PG&E's, DRA's, TURN's and CFC's recommendations in this area, this provision is supported by the record. In light of the various compromises set forth in the Agreement, this provision is reasonable and in the public interest." Motion to adopt settlement agreement at 39.</p>	
<p><u>5. Reducing Smart Meter and Smart Grid Funding</u></p> <p>CFC argued (along with DRA &TURN) that PG&E's should reduce spending on Smart Meter and Smart Grid within this GRC, particularly because PG&E did not adequately quantify these benefits in the form of cost savings that may be achieved with Smart Grid or SmartMeters.</p>	<p>Tr. Vol. 14, 1504-1517:CFC/Wodtke.</p>	
<p><u>6. Translating SAP forecasted dollars into FERC accounts</u></p> <p>CFC argued that PG&E current method of accounting whereby PG&E keeps track of expenses using a SAP system and the expenses are then translated into FERC dollars is unreliable and results in double-billing to ratepayers. CFC demonstrated that PG&E's SAP accounting process is contrary to the Commission's expectations of transparency. CFC argued that it is the Commission's expectation in SAP accounting to make the accounting matters "thoroughly transparent." However, CFC argued that SAP accounting is not transparent with PG&E stating that "they do not have a manual for translating SAP forecasted dollars in FERC accounts.</p>	<p>Ex. CFC-1, p. 23, lines 21-29;p.34 lines 1-26, p. 25, lines 1-27; p.26, lines 1-30;p.27, lines 1-28.</p>	
<p><u>7. New Business/WRO (Section 3.2.1(a))</u></p> <p>CFC commented on PG&E's New Business forecast, testifying that the net cost of extensions of service is</p>	<p>1. Ex. CFC-1, p. 21, lines 3-11 and p. 34, lines 3-4; Ex. CFC-29, p. 20, lines 21-26 and p. 21, lines 1-2</p> <p>2. Section 3.2.1 (a) of Settlement Agreement at page 1-4</p>	

unknown. As a result of CFC's (and DRA's) recommendations, Section 3.2.1(a) of the Agreement provides that PG&E shall remove \$8 million in forecast New Business/WRO from PG&E's requested GRC revenue requirements.	"Section 3.2.1(a) of the Agreement provides that PG&E shall remove \$8 million in forecast New Business/WRO from PG&E's requested GRC revenue requirements. Given DRA's and CFC's recommendations in this area, this provision is supported by the record. In light of the various compromises set forth in the Agreement, this provision is reasonable and in the public interest." Page 31 of the Motion to Adopt Settlement.	
8. <u>Attrition adjustments</u> CFC argued that, in light of the economy, PG&E should not be entitled to any attrition adjustment.	Ex. CFC-1, pp. 13-14.	
9. Base year that reflects current economic condition. CFC recommended that Commission postpone consideration of PG &E's rate application until PG&E evaluates, and adjusts 2009 recorded data	CFC exhibit 1 page 8-11.	

B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was DRA a party to the proceeding? (Y/N)	Yes	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding? (Y/N)	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Alget; California City-County Street Light Association (CAL-SLA); California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF); Coalition of California Utility Employees (CCUE); Direct Access Customer Coalition (DACC); Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA); Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC); Engineers and Scientists of California, Local 20 (ESC); Merced Irrigation District (Merced ID); Modesto Irrigation District (Modesto ID); South San Francisco Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) Western Power Trading Forum (WPTF); Women's Energy Matters (WEM); Greenlining Institute (Greenlining); City and County of San Francisco (CCSF); Southern California Edison.		
d. Describe how you coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid		

duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:

CFC did not duplicate the work of other parties. Although parties took a position that focused on PG&E decreasing its spending, CFC took unique positions when it came to issues such as postponing charging costs of new programs that are not essential or well-developed; using a different base year than 2008 for application that reflects the economic downturn, elimination of funding for DIMP, Technical training or LED streetlight replacement, elimination of balancing accounts for Rule 20A, major emergencies, RD &D , renewable generation; and an audit by regarding PG&E’s Proposition 16 spending.

Particularly, CFC took the lead in arguing that Affiliate Employee transfers during the proceeding which led to PG&E agreeing to PG&E shall not accept a permanent transfer of an employee from an affiliate (including PG&E Corporation) unless there is a need for the employee, the employee is fully qualified when compared to other employees and non-employees, and the compensation to be paid the employee is within market range.

Also, CFC took the lead in the argument revolving PG&E forecasting cost savings that may likely accompany cost increases in the GRC.

In conclusion, there is always some confluence of opinion when more than one consumer group participates, but each group seems to have a particular take on the subject and makes an original contribution.

C. Additional Comments on Part II (use line reference # or letter as appropriate):

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
1-10	Nicole A. Blake		<p>CFC argued on many specific cost issues during the course of this proceeding. CFC agreed to participate in the settlement agreement because CFC believes that it advanced the public interest of providing safe and reliable utility service. It is the nature of a settlement agreement that parties agree to compromise on certain issues, often settling on portions of their position. The Commission commended the Settling Parties for reaching an agreement that significantly reduced time and expense associated with the Commission’s deliberation of a fully litigated case. The Commission also recognized that the Settling Parties devoted a substantial amount of time and effort in achieving the settlement agreement. As a result of the settlement, the Commission stated in this D.11-05-018 that although “the Settling Parties resolved a number of specific issues in reaching agreement on these revenue requirement increase amount and levels...many costs raised during this proceeding is considered subsumed in overall settled revenue requirements for various segments of PG&E’s operations such as electric distribution, gas distribution, energy, supply, customer care, A&G expenses, shared services, depreciation, and capital-costs.” D. 11-05-018 at 16.</p> <p>CFC feels that settling on aspects of its position in the interest of a “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of the issues presented” should not</p>

			mean a compromise in CFC’s compensation award. CFC worked tirelessly to deconstruct costs and PG&E’s potential overspending. It is because of CFC’s work as well as other parties that we were able to achieve an overall reduction of PG&E’s revenue requirement that will benefit utility customers. Consequently, CFC asks for an award of the full amount requested.
--	--	--	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION (to be completed by Claimant except where indicated)

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

Concise explanation as to how the cost of claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)	CPUC Verified
<p>The settlement and other provisions of D.11-05-018 will result in a \$615 million reduction of PG&E’s proposed revenue requirement in PG&E’s request. This will translate into direct ratepayer savings.</p> <p>As for CFC’s effort, the Settlement Agreement removes \$8 million in forecast New Business/WRO from PG&E’s requested GRC revenue requirement.</p> <p>As for DIMP expenditures, the Settlement Agreement required that PG&E create a MWC for its DIMP, with a one-way balancing account mechanism set at \$60 million for DIMP costs for the term of the next GRC cycle, with any unspent funds at the end of the cycle to be returned to customers in the next GRC.</p> <p>Section 3.6.2 (d) of the Settlement Agreement provides that, during the term of this 2011 test year GRC cycle, PG&E shall not accept a permanent transfer of an employee from an affiliate (including PG&E Corporation) unless there is a need for the employee, the employee is fully qualified when compared to the other employees and non-employees, and compensation to be paid within market range. It is unknown the exact monetary benefits ratepayers will realize from this adoption however, PG&E will have to account for reasons why this transfer is necessary in the future.</p> <p>Because of CFC’s efforts PG&E’s proposal for new balancing accounts will not be adopted. This adoption lessens the possibility of sheltering costs from GRC-level scrutiny.</p> <p>The Settling Agreement adopts the recommendation proposed by CFC regarding including cost savings in its forecast. Specifically, it provides that in future GRCs, PG&E will not add a new type of cost to the revenue</p>	

requirement without estimating and including in the revenue requirement the savings to be achieved by the new type of cost or an explanation of the reasons there will be no cost savings. Ratepayers will benefit in the form of added Commission scrutiny over PG&E revenue requirement.

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Alexis Wodtke	2010	608.8	\$350	D. 11-04-028	\$213,080				
N/A									
<i>Subtotal:</i>						<i>Subtotal:</i>			
EXPERT FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
N/A									
N/A									
<i>Subtotal:</i>					\$213,080	<i>Subtotal:</i>			
OTHER FEES									
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are claiming (paralegal, travel, etc.):									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
N/A									
<i>Subtotal:</i>						<i>Subtotal:</i>			
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Alexis Wodtke	2010	1.5	\$175.00	D. 11-04-028	\$262.50				
Nicole A. Blake	2011	12	\$87.50	See Attachment 1	\$1,050				
<i>Subtotal:</i>					1,312.50	<i>Subtotal:</i>			
COSTS									
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount			
<i>Subtotal:</i>						<i>Subtotal:</i>			
TOTAL REQUEST \$:						TOTAL AWARD \$:			

When entering items, type over bracketed text; add additional rows as necessary.
 *If hourly rate based on CPUC decision, provide decision number; otherwise, attach rationale.
 **Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.

C. Attachments or Comments Documenting Specific Claim (Claimant completes; attachments not attached to final Decision):

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Basis for Rate Explanation
2	Certificate of Service
3	Hours/Issue Record

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments (CPUC completes):

#	Reason

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS
 Within 30 days after service of this claim, Commission Staff
 or any other party may file a response to the claim (see § 1804(c))

(CPUC completes the remainder of this form)

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim (Y/N)?

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Disposition

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6)) (Y/N)?

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) _____.
2. The claimed fees and costs [, as adjusted herein,] are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The total of reasonable contribution is \$ _____.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The claim, with any adjustment set forth above, [satisfies/fails to satisfy] all requirements of Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Claimant is awarded \$ _____.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, _____ shall pay claimant the total award. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime,

three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning _____, 200__, the 75th day after the filing of claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision [is/is not] waived.
4. [This/these] proceeding[s] [is/are] closed.
5. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

ATTACHMENT 1

Basis for Rate

Nicole Blake

Ms. Blake is a staff attorney at Consumer Federation of California with 1 ½ years of attorney experience and close to 10 months appearing before the California Public Utilities Commission. Ms. Blake graduated from UC Hastings College of the Law. During her study at UC Hastings, Ms. Blake was a CPUC intern for Commissioner Chong during the summer and fall months of 2008.

Decision 08-04-010 adopted Intervenor rates for year 2011. The rate range for 0-2 years adopted by the Commission in D. 08-04-101 is \$150-205. CFC feels that based on Nicole Blake's experience practicing before the Commission and comparing other rates attorney's rates with similar experience before the PUC, an hourly rate of \$175 is appropriate. CFC divided this hourly rate in half for Intervenor Compensation preparation.

**Attachment 2:
Certificate of Service by Customer**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing **CLAIM AND ORDER ON REQUEST FOR INTERVENOR COMPENSATION** by (check as appropriate):

hand delivery;
 first-class mail; and/or
 electronic mail

to the following persons appearing on the official Service List:

EL W. DOUGLASS
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: WESTERN POWER TRADING
FORUM/ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL ENERGY
FEDERATION
MARKETS/EQUINIX, INC./DIRECT ACCESS
CUSTOMER COALITION

KAREN N. MILLS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU

STEPHANIE C. CHEN
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE

STEVEN KELLY
POLICY DIRECTOR
INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS ASSOC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS
ASSOCIATION

HAYLEY GOODSON
STAFF ATTORNEY
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000
FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

KEVIN J. SIMONSEN
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES
646 E. THIRD AVE.
DURANGO, CA 81301
FOR: ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES

FRANCIS MCNULTY
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
ELECTRIC/SOUTHERN
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON

KEITH MELVILLE
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
101 ASH STREET, HQ 13D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS &
CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

DAVID J. BYERS, ESQ.
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MCCRACKEN, BYERS & HAESLOOP, LLP
870 MITTEN ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010
FOR: CALIFORNIA CITY-COUNTY STREET

RACHAEL E. KOSS
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, SUITE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
FOR: COALITION OF CALIFORNIA UTILITY
EMPLOYEE

LIGHT ASSOCIATION

LAURA J. TUDISCO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5032
234
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: DIVISION OF RATEPAYERS ADVOCATE

WILLIAM K. SANDERS
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682
FOR: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NORA SHERIFF
ALCANTAR & KAHL
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: ENERGY PRODUCERS & USERS COALITION

PATRICK G. GOLDEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MAIL CODE B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

BRIAN T. CRAGG
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, DAY & LAMPREY
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS OF
CALIFORNIA LOCAL 20

EDWARD W. O'NEILL
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-6533
FOR: SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN IRRIGATION
DISTRICT

BRIAN K. CHERRY
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77N BEALE ST., PO BOX 770000, MC B10C
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

REBECCA WILLIFORD
LD ACCESS/Ryder FNDTN FELLOWSHIP
DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704-1204
FOR: DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES

BARBARA GEORGE
WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS
PO BOX 548
FAIRFAX, CA 94978-0548
FOR: WOMERN'S ENERGY MATTERS

JAMES WEIL
DIRECTOR
AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE
PO BOX 1916
SEBASTOPOL, CA 95473
FOR: AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE

NICOLE A. BLAKE
STAFF ATTORNEY
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA
1107 9TH ST., STE. 625
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
DISTRICT/MODESTO
FOR: CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA

ANN L. TROWBRIDGE
DAY CARTER MURPHY LLC
3620 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE 205
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864
FOR: MERCED IRRIGATION
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Information Only

ASHAR KHAN
VISIUM ASSET MANAGEMENT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000

CLEO ZAGREAN
MACQUARIE CAPITAL (USA)
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000

DONN DAVY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LAUREN DUKE
DEUTSCHE BANK SECURITIES INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000

NAAZ KHUMAWALA
MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, TX 00000

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

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

JUDY PAU
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

MARTIN HOMEC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000
FOR: WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS

MICHELLE GRANT
DYNEGY, INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, TX 00000-0000

SCOTT SENCHAK
DECADE CAPITAL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000-0000

JACK D'ANGELO
CATAPULT CAPITAL MANAGEMENT LLC
650 5TH AVENUE, 32ND FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10019

JULIEN DUMOULIN-SMITH
ASSOCIATE ANALYST
UBS INVESTMENT RESEARCH
1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10019

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

ANDREW YIM
ZIMMER LUCAS PARTNERS
535 MADISON AVE., 6TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10022

IVANA ERGOVIC
JEFFERIES & COMPANY, INC.
520 MADISON AVENUE, 19TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10022

JAMES J. HECKLER
LEVIN CAPITAL STRATEGIES
LLC
595 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

ANDERS NIELSEN
OPEN TOP SIGHTSEEING SAN FRANCISCO,
5500 TUXEDO ROAD
HYATTSVILLE, MD 20781

ROBERT BERMAN
BERMAN ECONOMICS
1915 GRAND COURT
VIENNA, VA 22182

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

HERB EMMRICH
SAN DEIGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS CO., GT14D6
555 WEST 5TH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

ANDREW STEINBERG
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS CO.
555 W. 5TH STREET, GT 14D6
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013-1034

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

KRIS G. VYAS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
QUAD 3-B
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

CENTRAL FILES
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP31E
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

MICHAEL TURNIPSEED
EXEC. DIR.
KERN COUNTY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
331 TRUTUN AVENUE
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301
FOR: KERN COUNTY TAXPAYERS ASSOC.

PAUL KERKORIAN
UTILITY COST MANAGEMENT LLC
6475 N. PALM AVENUE, SUITE 105
FRESNO, CA 93704

ROBERT RATHIE
WELLINGTON LAW OFFICE
857 CASS STREET, SUITE D
MONTEREY, CA 93940

SUE MARA
CONSULTANT
RTO ADVISORS, LLC
164 SPRINGDALE WAY
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94062

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

THOMAS J. LONG
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

FRASER D. SMITH
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

MANUEL RAMIREZ
SAN FRANCISCO PUC - POWER ENTERPRISE
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

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

BRUCE P. FRASER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

KAREN TERRANOVA
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

WILLIAM MITCHELL
COMPETITIVE POWER VENTURES, INC.
55 2ND STREET, SUITE 525
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-1814

EDWARD G. POOLE
ANDERSON & POOLE
601 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108-2812

SALLE E. YOO
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

VIDHYA PRABHAKARAN
DAVIS WRIGHT & TREMAINE LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800

MARTIN A. MATTES
ATTORNEY
NOSSAMAN, LLP

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4799

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
425 DIVISADERO ST. STE 303
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117-2242

CASE ADMINISTRATION
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

SEAN P. BEATTY
DIR - WEST REGULATORY AFFAIRS
GENON ENERGY, INC.
PO BOX 192
PITTSBURGH, CA 94565

WILLIAM F. DIETRICH
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DIETRICH LAW
2977 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, NO. 613
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598-3535

DAVID MARCUS
PO BOX 1287
BERKELEY, CA 94701

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

SAMUEL S. KANG
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 2ND FLR.
BERKELEY, CA 94704

ENRIQUE GALLARDO
LEGAL COUNSEL
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704-1051

KARLA GILBRIDE
DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, 4TH FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704-1204

ELIZABETH RASMUSSEN
PROJECT MGR.
MARIN ENERGY AUTHORITY
781 LINCOLN AVENUE, SUITE 320
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901

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

JAN REID
COAST ECONOMICS CONSULTING
3185 GROSS ROAD
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95062

JOY A. WARREN
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
1231 11TH STREET
MODESTO, CA 95354

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH
44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE
MENDOCINO, CA 95460

GARRICK JONES
JBS ENERGY
311 D STREET
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA 95605

CAROLYN KEHREIN
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES
2602 CELEBRATION WAY
WOODLAND, CA 95776

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

LYNN HAUG
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
2600 CAPITAL AVENUE, SUITE 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5931

RICHARD MCCANN
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP

JOHN LARREA
CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF FOOD PROCESSORS

8801 FOLSOM BOULEVARD, SUITE 290
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826-3250

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, STE 250
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

RALPH R. NEVIS
DAY CARTER & MURPHY LLP
3620 AMERICAN RIVER DR., SUITE 205
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864

State Service

SCOTT MURTISHAW
CPUC
EMAIL ONLY
GAS
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BELINDA GATTI
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CLAYTON K. TANG
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAO A. PHAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID K. FUKUTOME
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
ROOM 5042
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID PECK
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH
ROOM 4103
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DONALD J. LAFRENZ
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS
BRA
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DONNA-FAY BOWER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ELAINE CHAN LAU
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

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

NICHOLAS SHER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4007
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

RICHARD A. MYERS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS & NATURAL GAS
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ROBERT M. POCTA
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SARAH R. THOMAS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5033
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TRUMAN L. BURNS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

Executed on July 7, 2011 in Sacramento,

//s//

Nicole A. Blake
1107 9th Street, #625
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 498-9608
Fax: (916) 498-9611
Email: blake@consumercal.org

