

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

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Operations and Practices of Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Determine Violations of Public Utilities Code Section 451, General Order 112, and Other Applicable Standards, Laws, Rules and Regulations in Connection with the San Bruno Explosion and Fire on September 9, 2010.

I.12-01-007  
(Filed January 12, 2012)

(Not Consolidated)

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Operations and Practices of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Natural Gas Transmission Pipeline System in Locations with Higher Population Density.

I.11-11-009  
(Filed November 10, 2011)

(Not Consolidated)

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Operations and Practices of Pacific Gas and Electric Company with Respect to Facilities Records for its Natural Gas Transmission System Pipelines.

I.11-02-016  
(Filed February 24, 2011)

(Not Consolidated)

**RESPONSE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
TO PG&E's MOTION TO REOPEN THE EVIDENTIARY RECORD IN THE  
COORDINATED PENALTY PHASE; REQUEST FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME  
FOR RESPONSE AND VACATING BRIEFING SCHEDULE ESTABLISHED  
IN JULY 12, 2013 EMAIL RULING**

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney  
THERESA L. MUELLER  
AUSTIN M. YANG

Attorneys for:  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 234  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4682  
Telephone: (415) 554-6761  
Facsimile: (415) 554-4763  
Email: austin.yang@sfgov.org

July 26, 2013

## I. RESPONSE

Pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice and Procedure 11.1(e) and Administrative Law Judges Wetzell and Yip-Kikugawa's July 17, 2013 email ruling, the City and County of San Francisco respectfully submits this response in opposition to PG&E's Motion to Reopen to Evidentiary Record In The Coordinated Penalty Phase; Request For Order Shortening Time For Response And Vacating Briefing Schedule Established In July 12, 2013 Email Ruling (PG&E Motion). In its motion, PG&E asserts that the Commission must reopen the evidentiary record and allow PG&E to submit additional evidence because the penalty proposal contained in CPSD's Amended Reply Brief<sup>1</sup> "relies upon different law and different purported facts than CPSD's prior proposal."<sup>2</sup> As discussed more fully below, PG&E's motion fails to provide good cause to reopen the record. It fails to show both that there are material changes in the facts or law and that PG&E acted with diligence in pursuing the need to submit additional evidence. Further, PG&E will suffer no prejudice if the record is not reopened since the ALJs have already established a briefing schedule that would allow PG&E the opportunity to rebut purportedly new legal arguments, and attempt to show why CPSD's beliefs and assumptions "have no support in the evidentiary record."<sup>3</sup> For these reasons, the Commission must deny PG&E's motion.

### A. PG&E Has Failed To Provide Good Cause To Reopen The Evidentiary Record

A party seeking to reopen the record to submit additional evidence must demonstrate both good cause and due diligence.<sup>4</sup> Reopening the record is not a matter of a right but rests upon the sound discretion of the trial court.<sup>5</sup> PG&E acknowledges that as the party seeking to reopen

---

<sup>1</sup> CPSD's Amended Reply Brief was filed on July 16, 2013 pursuant to an email ruling from ALJs Wetzell and Yip-Kikugawa.

<sup>2</sup> PG&E Motion at pp. 2-3.

<sup>3</sup> PG&E Motion at p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Ensher, Alexander & Barsoom, Inc. v. Ensher*, (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 318, 326.

<sup>5</sup> *Sanchez v. Bay General Hospital* (1981) 116 Cal.App.3d 776, 793.

the record, it must show that there are material changes in fact or law that have occurred since the conclusion of the hearing.<sup>6</sup> PG&E identifies only one change in its brief -- that “CPSD has abandoned its original penalty proposal based on the existing evidentiary record in favor of new and unsupported assertions and rationales regarding the amount and form of the penalty.”<sup>7</sup> As described below, this is a not a proper basis to reopen the record.

Simply because PG&E disagrees with the characterization of the evidence does not mean that it is entitled to reopen the record to submit contradictory evidence. PG&E claims that it needs to submit new evidence to refute CPSD’s recommendations, which are allegedly “based on assumptions, mistaken ‘facts,’ and a distortion of the conclusions of its own witness.”<sup>8</sup> Even if these allegations are true, the proper recourse is to explain, through briefing, why the “assumptions, mistaken facts, and distortions of conclusions” are not supported by the evidence.<sup>9</sup> Assertions and rationales constitute argument and inference drawn upon the existing evidentiary record. Purported “new and unsupported assertions and rationales” do not create a right for PG&E to submit additional evidence.

Likewise, the evidentiary record should already be sufficient for PG&E “to demonstrate that CPSD’s new disallowance proposal is inconsistent with the Overland analysis on which CPSD says it is based.”<sup>10</sup> The Overland analysis was commissioned by CPSD. Both Overland’s opening and rebuttal testimonies are already admitted into the record. If PG&E is simply attempting to show that CPSD’s new proposal is not supported by the Overland analysis, PG&E may use to the materials already in the record. If, however, PG&E is attempting to introduce

---

<sup>6</sup> PG&E Motion at p. 3; Commission Rule of Practice and Procedure 13.14(b).

<sup>7</sup> PG&E Motion at p. 3.

<sup>8</sup> PG&E Motion at p. 2.

<sup>9</sup> PG&E’s motion fails to even allege that CPSD’s Amended Reply Brief relies on any new facts that are not already in the evidentiary record, as opposed to allegedly misconstruing facts or drawing incorrect conclusions.

<sup>10</sup> PG&E Motion at p. 6.

new evidence to contradict the Overland analysis, it has waived that opportunity, as described more fully below.

The Commission has granted PG&E more than sufficient due process by allowing PG&E to file a Response to the Amended Reply Brief. It is axiomatic that the purpose of briefing is to aid the fact finder by directing it to pertinent case law and references to the record supporting findings of fact. If PG&E challenges CPSD's assumptions, or the inferences drawn from the facts contained in CPSD's Amended Reply Brief, PG&E's Response should direct the Commission to the relevant facts in the record that purportedly contradict or disprove those assumptions. Similarly, if PG&E contests CPSD's conclusions, PG&E's Response should explain why those conclusions are not supported in the record. PG&E has failed to demonstrate any good cause to reopen the record and the Commission should deny PG&E's motion.

**B. PG&E Has Failed To Provide A Credible Reason Why It Did Not Produce The Proposed Evidence Earlier And PG&E Will Suffer No Prejudice If The Record Remains Closed.**

Commission Rule of Practice and Procedure 13.14(b) explicitly requires the moving party "to explain why such evidence was not previously adduced." Good cause to reopen the record is absent where a party makes the tactical decision to not introduce evidence into the record when it has the opportunity to do so and delays in seeking to reopen the record.<sup>11</sup> In its motion, PG&E asserts that it will submit four categories of additional evidence: (1) information related to PG&E's actual and forecast spending in its PSEP, (2) information related to other unrecovered or unrecoverable costs, (3) information related to PG&E's accrual of \$200 million for potential penalties, and (4) recent reactions from ratings agencies to CPSD's Amended Reply Brief.<sup>12</sup> The

---

<sup>11</sup> *Horning v. Schilberg* (2005) 130 Cal.App.4th 197, 209 (motion to reopen evidence properly denied where moving party waited nearly six months before making motion and had made tactical decision to not introduce evidence earlier), See also *Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman v. Cohen*, (1987) 191 Cal.App.3d 1035, 1052–1053, (denial of motion to reopen not an abuse of discretion where failure to introduce evidence earlier was the product of trial tactics) and *Brodin v. Marin Humane Society* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1212, 1222, (motion to reopen is subject to a diligence requirement).

<sup>12</sup> PG&E motion at pp. 5-6.

first three categories of information were clearly available to PG&E before the close of the evidentiary record, and the fourth category is information that would never have been introduced into the record in the first instance.

PG&E clearly had the opportunity to and did introduce evidence on all four categories of information, including analysis from ratings agencies. During the March 4, 2013 hearings, PG&E asked the Overland witnesses whether their analysis included amounts of PSEP costs that PG&E shareholders were required to pay,<sup>13</sup> clarified that Overland's analysis contemplated PG&E paying either or both a fine and disallowance in rates,<sup>14</sup> and PG&E even introduced exhibits specifically addressing costs PG&E believed were unrecovered or unrecoverable.<sup>15</sup> The rebuttal analysis also addressed the \$200 million PG&E had accrued for potential penalties,<sup>16</sup> meaning that PG&E had the opportunity to question Overland on that issue during cross-examination. Indeed, although PG&E alleges that on rebuttal "Overland clarified for the first time, that it meant that \$2.25 billion was the maximum amount of new equity PG&E could raise to fund a fine and all other unrecovered and unrecoverable costs,"<sup>17</sup> PG&E admits, that "some evidence of those costs came in during cross-examination of Overland."<sup>18</sup>

In addition, there is no need for additional reports from the reporting agencies. PG&E's financial testimony is already replete with statements from various reporting agencies regarding the analysis contained in the Overland Report, and potential penalties as a result of these proceedings.<sup>19</sup> If PG&E wanted to further develop the record by probing Overland's statements on any of these issues, it could have done so during the hearings. Furthermore, there is no right to introduce ratings agencies' reports responsive to penalty recommendations. As part of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Joint RT at p. 1370:17-1371:9 (Overland/CPSD).

<sup>14</sup> Joint RT at 1373:4-12 (CPSD/Overland).

<sup>15</sup> Joint RT at 1390:7-17 (CPSD/Overland).

<sup>16</sup> Joint Exhibit 53 at p. 22.

<sup>17</sup> PG&E Motion at p. 3 (emphasis in original).

<sup>18</sup> PG&E Motion at p. 3 (emphasis added).

<sup>19</sup> Joint Exhibit 66.

original briefing schedule, the most recent statements from the ratings agencies would never have been admitted into the record. If the Commission followed PG&E's logic, the Commission would need to reopen the record every time there is a new ratings agency report addressing PG&E's financial viability. This would yield a preposterous result and is unnecessary because the record already reflects statements from the ratings agencies. None of the new proposed evidence is necessary for the Commission's resolution of these proceedings.

PG&E is simply trying to supplement the record with self-serving evidence to compensate for the fact that it is unhappy with its prior litigation strategy. If PG&E truly felt prejudiced by the Overland rebuttal testimony then it could have sought to file responsive testimony at that time. Instead, PG&E has waited nearly six months since the "clarifying" statements were served before claiming that it now needs to submit responsive testimony on these issues. Not only has PG&E had the opportunity to question Overland on these issues, but it has unnecessarily delayed seeking relief to submit additional evidence. The Commission should deny PG&E's motion.

**C. PG&E Will Suffer No Prejudice If the Commission Denies This Motion.**

Finally, PG&E will not be prejudiced if the Commission does not allow the proposed additional evidence. As discussed above, PG&E had the opportunity to introduce additional evidence on cross-examination or seek to introduce additional testimony. The other parties to this case all recommended a combination of fines and penalties of varying degrees,<sup>20</sup> and PG&E had the opportunity to respond to those proposals. PG&E saw no need to reopen the evidentiary record following the original round of briefing. PG&E has not acted with diligence and will not suffer any prejudice if the Commission denies this motion.

---

<sup>20</sup> CCSF Opening Brief on Fines and Remedies at pp. 1-2; DRA Opening Brief on Fines and Remedies at p. 19; TURN Opening Brief on Fines and Remedies at pp. 2-3; and San Bruno Opening Brief on Fines and Remedies at pp. 7-8.

**D. There Is No Need For Additional Pages In The Supplemental Briefs.**

All subsequent briefs should follow the 10-page limit set forth in the July 12, 2013 ALJ rulings, and respond to *only the new issues* presented in CPSD's Amended Reply Brief. CPSD's Amended Reply Brief was limited to 10-pages with the understanding that the subsequent brief would follow a similar page length. There is no need to grant additional pages.

Dated: July 26, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney  
THERESA L. MUELLER  
Chief Energy and Telecommunications Deputy  
AUSTIN M. YANG  
Deputy City Attorney

By:         /S/    
AUSTIN M. YANG

Attorneys for  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, KIANA V. DAVIS, 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) 554-4700.

On July 26, 2013 I served:

**RESPONSE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
TO PG&E's MOTION TO REOPEN THE EVIDENTIARY RECORD IN THE  
COORDINATED PENALTY PHASE; REQUEST FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME  
FOR RESPONSE AND VACATING BRIEFING SCHEDULE ESTABLISHED  
IN JULY 12, 2013 EMAIL RULING**

by electronic mail on all parties in CPUC Proceeding No. I.12-01-007, I.11-11-009 and I.11-02-016 on the attached service lists.

The following addresses without an email address were served:

BY UNITED STATES MAIL: Following ordinary business practices, I sealed true and correct copies of the above documents in addressed envelope(s) and placed them at my workplace for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service. I am readily familiar with the practices of the San Francisco City Attorney's Office for collecting and processing mail. In the ordinary course of business, the sealed envelope(s) that I placed for collection would be deposited, postage prepaid, with the United States Postal Service that same day.

LAURA DOLL PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY 77 BEALE STREET, RM. 1075 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105	ATTN.: AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY 77 BEALE ST., STE. 100 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
--	---

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on July 26, 2013, at San Francisco, California.

/S/

\_\_\_\_\_  
KIANA V. DAVIS



Email Service List I.12-01-007

jmalkin@orrick.com  
theresa.mueller@sfgov.org  
hym@cpuc.ca.gov  
tbo@cpuc.ca.gov  
tlong@turn.org  
bstrottman@meyersnave.com  
ESelmon@Jemzar.com  
BTS1@pge.com  
julien.dumoulin-smith@ubs.com  
kkonolige@bcgpartners.com  
kxhy@pge.com  
lauren.duke@db.com  
mchediak@bloomberg.net  
wmc@a-klaw.com  
ppatterson2@nyc.rr.com  
pbattaglia@bcgpartners.com  
thnxvm@gmail.com  
rajeev.lalwani@morganstanley.com  
SRRD@pge.com  
dvanhoogstraten@stinson.com  
mfallon@taloncap.com  
anjani.vedula@db.com  
jonathan.arnold@db.com  
kfallon@sirfunds.com  
jdangelo@catapult-llc.com  
mgoldenberg@luminusmgmt.com  
sunny.kwak@macquarie.com  
ted@pointstate.com  
bnaeve@levincap.com  
Jheckler@levincap.com  
NStein@LevinCap.com  
John.Apgar@baml.com  
stephen.byrd@morganstanley.com  
Gregory.Reiss@mlp.com  
NKhumawala@WolfeTrahan.com  
randall@nexusamllc.com  
christopher.turnure@morgan.com  
nazia.x.sheikh@jmorgan.com  
andrew.greenberg@cwt.com  
ken.irvin@cwt.com  
terence.healey@cwt.com  
kdaly@stinson.com  
catherine.mazzeo@swgas.com  
dng@semprautilities.com  
jlsalazar@semprautilities.com  
stomkins@semprautilities.com  
SHruby@SempraUtilities.com  
MFranco@SempraUtilities.com  
RPrince@SempraUtilities.com  
npedersen@hanmor.com  
angelica.morales@sce.com  
case.admin@sce.com

Email Service List I.12-01-007

douglas.porter@sce.com  
Francis.McNulty@sce.com  
gloria.ing@sce.com  
maguirre@amslawyers.com  
khelmuth@cityofmadera.com  
cjackson@ci.sanbruno.ca.us  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com  
rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com  
chh@cpuc.ca.gov  
djg@cpuc.ca.gov  
ttf@cpuc.ca.gov  
austin.yang@sfgov.org  
marcel@turn.org  
filings@a-klaw.com  
mlw3@pge.com  
nes@a-klaw.com  
sgs@dcbsf.com  
teb3@pge.com  
gburke@ap.org  
BCragg@GoodinMacbride.com  
cem@newsdata.com  
regrelcuccases@pge.com  
chris\_king@siemens.com  
dng6@pge.com  
jmullan@meyersnave.com  
smeyers@meyersnave.com  
deborah.slone@doj.ca.gov  
dmarcus2@sbcglobal.net  
service@cforat.org  
henrypielage@comcast.net  
berlin@susieberlinlaw.com  
abb@eslawfirm.com  
William.Westfield@smud.org  
ATrowbridge@DayCarterMurphy.com  
DBP@cpuc.ca.gov  
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov  
tony.marino@sen.ca.gov  
rst@cpuc.ca.gov  
ako@cpuc.ca.gov  
crs@cpuc.ca.gov  
edd@cpuc.ca.gov  
frl@cpuc.ca.gov  
jzr@cpuc.ca.gov  
jmh@cpuc.ca.gov  
kcl@cpuc.ca.gov  
kab@cpuc.ca.gov  
map@cpuc.ca.gov  
msw@cpuc.ca.gov  
mlc@cpuc.ca.gov  
nb2@cpuc.ca.gov  
ram@cpuc.ca.gov  
rcc@cpuc.ca.gov  
tdp@cpuc.ca.gov

Email Service List I.11-11-009

cjackson@ci.sanbruno.ca.us  
theresa.mueller@sfgov.org  
hym@cpuc.ca.gov  
tbo@cpuc.ca.gov  
tlong@tum.org  
JMalkin@orrick.com  
ESelmon@Jemzar.com  
RegRelCPUCCases@pge.com  
mchediak@bloomberg.net  
wmc@a-klaw.com  
ray.welch@navigantconsulting.com  
mrw@mrwassoc.com  
dvanhoogstraten@stinson.com  
mfallon@taloncap.com  
anjani.vedula@db.com  
jonathan.amold@db.com  
lauren.duke@db.com  
kfallon@sirfunds.com  
ted@PointState.com  
jdangelo@catapult-llc.com  
mgoldenberg@luminusmgmt.com  
bnaeve@levincap.com  
Jheckler@levincap.com  
Gregory.Reiss@mlp.com  
scott.senchak@decade-llc.com  
randall@nexusamllc.com  
andrew.greenberg@cwt.com  
ken.irvin@cwt.com  
terence.healey@cwt.com  
kdaly@stinson.com  
catherine.mazzeo@swgas.com  
dng@semprautilities.com  
JLSalazar@SempraUtilities.com  
stomkins@semprautilities.com  
SHruby@SempraUtilities.com  
MFranco@SempraUtilities.com  
RPrince@SempraUtilities.com  
npedersen@hanmor.com  
angelica.morales@sce.com  
douglas.porter@sce.com  
Francis.McNulty@sce.com  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com  
rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com  
chh@cpuc.ca.gov  
psb@cpuc.ca.gov  
austin.yang@sfgov.org  
marcel@tum.org  
nsuetake@tum.org  
axvu@pge.com  
jlpc@pge.com  
LKL1@pge.com  
nes@a-klaw.com  
sgs@dcbsf.com

Email Service List I.11-11-009

slg0@pge.com  
teb3@pge.com  
gburke@ap.org  
BCragg@GoodinMacbride.com  
cem@newsdata.com  
bkc7@pge.com  
grant.kolling@cityofpaloalto.org  
chris\_king@siemens.com  
bstrottman@meyersnave.com  
jmullan@meyersnave.com  
smeyers@meyersnave.com  
dmarcus2@sbcglobal.net  
service@cforat.org  
henrypielage@comcast.net  
berlin@susieberlinlaw.com  
abb@eslawfirm.com  
wwester@smud.org  
Mark.Gall@smud.org  
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com  
dweber.nwngs@nwnatural.com  
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov  
ayk@cpuc.ca.gov  
ako@cpuc.ca.gov  
dbp@cpuc.ca.gov  
edd@cpuc.ca.gov  
kcl@cpuc.ca.gov  
kab@cpuc.ca.gov  
mk1@cpuc.ca.gov  
nb2@cpuc.ca.gov  
ram@cpuc.ca.gov  
skh@cpuc.ca.gov  
tff@cpuc.ca.gov

Email Service List I.11-02-016

hym@cpuc.ca.gov  
tbo@cpuc.ca.gov  
theresa.mueller@sfgov.org  
tlong@tum.org  
JMalkin@Orrick.com  
smeyers@meyersnave.com  
bmcc@mccarthyllaw.com  
berlin@susieberlinlaw.com  
martinhomec@gmail.com  
ESelmon@Jemzar.com  
RegRelCPUCCases@pge.com  
cassandra.sweet@dowjones.com  
enriqueg@greenlining.org  
Gregory.Reiss@mlp.com  
jheckler@levincap.com  
j7se@pge.com  
julien.dumoulin-smith@ubs.com  
lauren.duke@db.com  
mchediak@bloomberg.net  
wmc@a-klaw.com  
p.duller@btinternet.com  
thnxvm@gmail.com  
StephanieC@greenlining.org  
dvanhoogstraten@stinson.com  
scott.senchak@decade-llc.com  
mfallon@taloncap.com  
anjani.vedula@db.com  
kfallon@sirfunds.com  
ted@PointState.com  
jdangelo@catapult-llc.com  
mgoldenberg@luminusmgmt.com  
sunny.kwak@macquarie.com  
bnaeve@levincap.com  
NStein@LevinCap.com  
randall@nexusamllc.com  
andrew.greenberg@cwt.com  
ken.irvin@cwt.com  
terence.healey@cwt.com  
kdaly@stinson.com  
naaz.khumawala@baml.com  
catherine.mazzeo@swgas.com  
dng@SempraUtilities.com  
JLsalazar@SempraUtilities.com  
SHruby@SempraUtilities.com  
MFranco@SempraUtilities.com  
RPrince@SempraUtilities.com  
npedersen@hanmor.com  
angelica.morales@sce.com  
douglas.porter@sce.com  
Francis.McNulty@sce.com  
gcaldwell@sanbruno.ca.gov  
kfabry@sanbruno.ca.gov

Email Service List I.11-02-016

cjackson@ci.sanbruno.ca.us  
rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com  
chh@cpuc.ca.gov  
rcc@cpuc.ca.gov  
austin.yang@sfgov.org  
nsuetake@tum.org  
BKC7@pge.com  
bts1@pge.com  
cpj2@pge.com  
filings@a-klaw.com  
lhj2@pge.com  
nes@a-klaw.com  
sgs@dcbsf.com  
teb3@pge.com  
gburke@ap.org  
BCragg@GoodinMacbride.com  
cem@newsdata.com  
grant.kolling@cityofpaloalto.org  
chris\_king@siemens.com  
bstrottman@meyersnave.com  
jmullan@meyersnave.com  
service@cforat.org  
pucservice@dralegal.org  
margaret@mfelts.com  
abb@eslawfirm.com  
wwester@smud.org  
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com  
dbp@cpuc.ca.gov  
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov  
michael.colvin@cpuc.ca.gov  
kwt@cpuc.ca.gov  
ayk@cpuc.ca.gov  
ako@cpuc.ca.gov  
caj@cpuc.ca.gov  
djg@cpuc.ca.gov  
edd@cpuc.ca.gov  
cpe@cpuc.ca.gov  
jmh@cpuc.ca.gov  
kcl@cpuc.ca.gov  
kab@cpuc.ca.gov  
mwt@cpuc.ca.gov  
mlc@cpuc.ca.gov  
nb2@cpuc.ca.gov  
ram@cpuc.ca.gov  
tdp@cpuc.ca.gov  
tcr@cpuc.ca.gov  
tff@cpuc.ca.gov