

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



**FILED**

09-17-08  
04:59 PM

Application of PACIFIC GAS AND  
ELECTRIC COMPANY to Recover Costs  
Related to the January 2008 Storms  
Recorded in the Catastrophic Event  
Memorandum Account (CEMA) Pursuant to  
Public Utility Code Section 454.9.

Application No. 08-03-017

(U 39 E)

**JOINT MOTION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND  
THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES  
FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

ED MOLDAVSKY  
Staff Counsel  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 703-5134  
Facsimile: (415) 703-2262  
Email: edm@cpuc.ca.gov

ROBERT B. MCLENNAN  
Law Department  
Pacific Gas And Electric Company  
Post Office Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94120  
Telephone: (415) 973-2069  
Facsimile: (415) 973-0516  
Email: rbm4@pge.com

Attorney for  
DIVISION OF RATEPAYER  
ADVOCATES

Attorney for  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: September 17, 2008

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

Application of PACIFIC GAS AND  
ELECTRIC COMPANY to Recover Costs  
Related to the January 2008 Storms  
Recorded in the Catastrophic Event  
Memorandum Account (CEMA) Pursuant to  
Public Utility Code Section 454.9.

Application No. 08-03-017

(U 39 E)

**JOINT MOTION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND  
THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES  
FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

Pursuant to Rule 12.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) request Commission approval of the attached Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement resolves all remaining issues in this application (which are within the authority of the Settling Parties to settle), PG&E's request for recovery of costs recorded in its Catastrophic Events Memorandum Account (CEMA) for the cost of restoring electric service and repairing electric distribution facilities damaged by the January 2008 storms.

This motion contains statements of factual and legal considerations sufficient to advise the Commission and other parties not expressly joining the Settlement Agreement of its scope and of the grounds on which approval is urged. The Settling Parties believe that the Settlement Agreement: (1) meets the Commission's criteria for approval of all party settlements; and (2) is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law and in the public interest, as required by Rule 12.1(d).

Pursuant to Rule 12.1(b), on September 9, 2008, the Settling Parties served e-mail notice of a settlement conference. On September 17, 2008, the Settling Parties held a settlement conference. No other party chose to come to the settlement conference.

## **I. BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

According to PG&E's application, a series of winter storms in early January 2008 caused \$77 million in restoration and repair costs to PG&E's electric distribution system. Pursuant to Decision 07-07-041, which confirmed that CEMA recovery is limited to jurisdictions with competent disaster declarations, PG&E's application asked for review of and authorization to recover the \$27.47 million of costs arising from the January 2008 storms in the counties and cities which had obtained gubernatorial disaster declarations. PG&E's request for recovery of costs included \$12.47 million in expense and \$15 million in capital costs arising from the restoration of service and repairs following the January 2008 storms. The \$27.47 million of costs included in the application would translate into a total revenue requirement of \$19.24 million to be recovered during 2009 and 2010.

After conducting discovery and analysis on PG&E's showing, DRA served a report on August 4, 2008 that recommended reductions of \$4.89 million in expense and \$15 million in capital of the original costs requested by PG&E. Based on its investigation and audit of PG&E's showing, DRA argued that PG&E did not demonstrate the incremental nature of its costs.

PG&E's August 20, 2008 rebuttal testimony argued that its costs are justified and are incremental to those authorized in base rates.

PG&E and DRA met to gain a better assessment of each other's case, to discuss the possibility of compromise of each other's positions, and the risk of litigation. The litigation uncertainty enabled the parties to get together and work out a compromise settlement agreeable to both parties.

## **II. THE SETTLEMENT**

The settlement consists of the following agreements by the Settling Parties:

1. The reasonable total costs recoverable from this CEMA application is \$23.44 million, consisting of \$15 million in capital costs and \$8.44 million in expenses. The revenue requirement resulting from these costs is \$14.94 million in electric revenue requirements, including interest through December 31, 2010, franchise fees, and uncollectibles, to be collected in rates with \$12.586 million collected in rates in 2009, and \$2.349 million in 2010<sup>1</sup>, with any under or over collections of these amounts accruing to the associated balancing accounts. Upon approval of this settlement by the Commission, PG&E will record commensurate amounts each year for the CEMA revenue requirement into the Distribution Revenue Adjustment Mechanism for rate recovery through its next available electric rate change in 2009 and through the Annual Electric True-up advice letter thereafter.

2. The Settling Parties agree that the Commission should find that it is reasonable for PG&E to recover \$14.94 million as PG&E's total authorized revenue requirement in this application. It is difficult to tie the final settlement amount to specific outcomes for individual issues; however, the final settlement amount does reflect litigation uncertainty assessed by one or both parties. This uncertainty includes, among other issues, the ability of either party to prove whether or not PG&E's requested costs were incremental.

### **III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT**

#### **A. Preconditions for Approval of All Party Settlements**

In a decision regarding PG&E's Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, the Commission established a standard for review of settlements. (Decision (D.) 88-12-083, 30 CPUC2d 189, 221-223. The decision was revised by D.89-03-062, but the revisions

---

<sup>1</sup> The revenue requirement numbers include interest calculated at the actual 90-day commercial paper rate through August 2008, and at the August 2008 90-day commercial paper rate thereafter on the unamortized balance through 2010. The numbers will change slightly over time as the forecasted 90-day commercial paper rate is replaced by the actual 90-day commercial paper rate in each month following August 2008.

did not affect the standard.) Rule 12.1(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure recites the standard:

"The Commission will not approve stipulations or settlements, whether contested or uncontested, unless the stipulation or settlement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest."

In a general rate case for San Diego Gas & Electric Company, the Commission amended the standard to adopt a policy on "all party" settlements. (D.92-12-019, 46 CPUC2d 538, 550-551.) As a "precondition" to approval of all party settlements, the Commission must be satisfied that:

- a. the settlement commands the unanimous sponsorship of all active parties to the proceeding;
- b. the sponsoring parties are fairly representative of the affected interests;
- c. no term of the settlement contravenes statutory provisions or prior Commission decisions; and
- d. the settlement conveys to the Commission sufficient information to permit it to discharge its future regulatory obligations with respect to the parties and their interests.

The Settling Parties comprise all active parties. No other party submitted testimony or indicated they would participate in the hearings. No other party attended, called in, or expressed interest in participating in the settlement conference.

The Settling Parties represent all affected interests. PG&E represents the interests of its shareholders and DRA represents the interests of ratepayers.

The Settling Parties are aware of no statutory provision or prior Commission decision that would be contravened or compromised by the Settlement Agreement.

The precondition regarding sufficient information applies principally to settlements that establish revenue requirements, rates, rules or conditions of service. (For example, a revenue requirement settlement might need to convey information sufficient

to allocate costs to customer classes.) The Settlement Agreement sets PG&E's total revenue requirement resulting from the CEMA application and specifies that PG&E may include the authorized revenue requirement in its Distribution Revenue Adjustment Mechanism for inclusion in rates as part of its next Annual Electric True-up advice letter.

In sum, the Settlement Agreement meets all four preconditions for Commission approval of an all party settlement.

#### **B. Reasonableness of the Settlement**

The four factors discussed above are preconditions for Commission approval, not a substitute for requirements that a settlement be reasonable, consistent with law and in the public interest. (D.95-05-042, 59 CPUC2d 779, 788.) In the Diablo Canyon decision cited above, the Commission discussed many factors that might be balanced in determining whether a proposed settlement is reasonable. (D.88-12-083, 30 CPUC2d 189, 221-223.) The Settlement Agreement meets most if not all of those standards.

First, the Settling Parties recognize that the most important element in determining the fairness of a settlement is the relationship of the settled amount to the risk that each party will obtain its desired result. (D.88-12-083, 30 CPUC2d 189, 267.) PG&E requested recovery for costs totaling \$27.47 million. DRA's report did not directly contest \$7.58 million of those costs. Discovery, which consisted of an audit of PG&E's showing as well as several data requests allowed DRA to gauge the strengths and weaknesses of PG&E's request. DRA also was in a better position to assess the strengths and weakness of its opposition to PG&E's request. The current stage of the proceeding has given the Settling Parties a fair opportunity to re-evaluate and settle their differences. The settled amount of \$23.44 million represents roughly 85% of PG&E's request and represents a fair assessment of each party's litigation risk. This outcome meets the Commission's criterion.

Second, the Settlement Agreement is a reasonable compromise of strongly held views.

Third, the Settlement Agreement will spare the Commission and the parties the effort required to litigate disputed issues. The Commission has a history of favoring settlements. Commission approval of the Settlement will provide speedy resolution of contested issues and will promote amicable working relations among the parties.

Fourth, counsel and advocates for the Settling Parties are experienced in public utility litigation.

Fifth, settlement negotiations were accomplished at arm's length and without collusion.

Sixth, the Settlement Agreement is apparently uncontested. No other party opposes the Settlement Agreement. The absence of adverse reaction from affected interests favors approval.

Seventh, the Settlement Agreement addresses all major issues within the scope of the proceeding, and within the authority of the Settling Parties to settle. The application seeks authorization to recover costs in the CEMA that were incurred for restoring utility service and making repairs in response to a declared disaster. The Settlement Agreement approves rate recovery of a level of costs acceptable to both PG&E and DRA.

We emphasize that the discussion of the Settlement Agreement is meant only to show that in reaching the Settlement Agreement the Settling Parties have considered all of the Commission's concerns. The Commission should review the Settlement Agreement as a unified, comprehensive resolution of the issues at hand. It would be unfair to the Settling Parties to try to match individual Settlement Agreement elements against the specific costs identified in the application and PG&E testimony, and then determine whether each match-up meets the standards for review of settlements. The willingness of the Settling Parties to cease their efforts to prove or disprove their cases is a key element of the Settlement Agreement.

For all of these reasons, the Settling Parties strongly believe that the Settlement Agreement is reasonable in light of the whole record.

**C. Consistency With Law**

As discussed above in the context of preconditions for approval of all party settlements, the Settling Parties are aware of no statutory provision or prior Commission decision that would be contravened or compromised by the Settlement Agreement.

**D. Public Interest**

There is a strong public policy favoring the settlement of disputes to avoid costly and protracted litigation. (D.88-12-083, 30 CPUC2d 189, 221.) Absent opposition and absent identification of any serious defect in the Settlement Agreement, the Commission should approve it.

Nonetheless, the Commission has long held that settlements submitted for review and approval are not simply the resolution of private disputes like those heard in civil court. The public interest and the interests of ratepayers must be considered, and it is the Commission's duty to protect those interests.

The principal public interest affected by this proceeding is delivery of safe, reliable electric service at reasonable rates. The Settlement Agreement advances this interest because it permits PG&E to recover reasonable costs of responding to a declared disaster. Taken as a whole, the Settlement Agreement is in the public interest.

**IV. CONCLUSION AND REQUESTED COMMISSION ACTION**

The Settling Parties believe the Settlement Agreement is: (1) reasonable in light of the testimony; (2) consistent with the law; (3) in the public interest; and (4) a mutually acceptable outcome to a pending proceeding, thereby avoiding the time, expense and uncertainty of litigation on issues raised in PG&E's CEMA application. It meets the Commission's standards for approval of all party settlements and of settlements in general.

Wherefore, for the foregoing reasons, the Settling Parties respectfully request that the Commission:

- (1) Adopt this Settlement Agreement in its entirety as reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law and in the public interest; and
- (2) Grant such other relief as the Commission finds just and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

/S/

\_\_\_\_\_  
ED MOLDAVSKY  
Staff Counsel  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 703-5134  
Facsimile: (415) 703-2262  
Email: edm@cpuc.ca.gov

Attorney for  
DIVISION OF RATEPAYER  
ADVOCATES

/S/

\_\_\_\_\_  
ROBERT B. MCLENNAN  
Law Department  
Pacific Gas And Electric Company  
Post Office Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94120  
Telephone: (415) 973-2069  
Facsimile: (415) 973-0516  
Email: rbm4@pge.com

Attorney for  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: September 17, 2008

Application of PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY to Recover Costs Related to the January 2008 Storms Recorded in the Catastrophic Event Memorandum Account (CEMA) Pursuant to Public Utility Code Section 454.9.

Application No. 08-03-017

(U 39 E)

**SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND THE  
DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES  
RESOLVING ISSUES IN THE  
CATASTROPHIC EVENT MEMORANDUM ACCOUNT PROCEEDING  
(APPLICATION NO. 08-03-017)**

In accordance with Article 12 of the California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) (together the "Settling Parties"), by and through their undersigned representatives, enter into this Settlement Agreement resolving issues in the Catastrophic Event Memorandum Account (CEMA) proceeding, Application 08-03-017. As a compromise among their respective litigation positions in Application 08-03-017, PG&E and DRA agree to and support all of the terms of this Settlement Agreement.

**I. THE CATASTROPHIC EVENT MEMORANDUM ACCOUNT PROCEEDING**

According to PG&E's application, a series of winter storms in early January 2008 caused \$77 million in restoration and repair costs to PG&E's electric distribution system. Pursuant to Decision 07-07-041, which confirmed that CEMA recovery is limited to jurisdictions with competent disaster declarations, PG&E's application asked for review of and authorization to recover the \$27.47 million of costs arising from the January 2008

storms in the counties and cities which had obtained gubernatorial disaster declarations. PG&E's request for recovery of costs included \$12.47 million in expense and \$15 million in capital costs arising from the restoration of service and repairs following the January 2008 storms. The \$27.47 million of costs included in the application would translate into a total revenue requirement of \$19.24 million to be recovered during 2009 and 2010.

After conducting discovery and analysis on PG&E's showing, DRA served a report on August 4, 2008 that recommended reductions of \$4.89 million in expense and \$15 million in capital of the original costs requested by PG&E. Based on its investigation and audit of PG&E's showing, DRA argued that PG&E did not demonstrate the incremental nature of its costs.

PG&E's August 20, 2008 rebuttal testimony argued that its costs are justified and are incremental to those authorized in base rates.

## **II. THE SETTLEMENT**

The two active parties entered into settlement discussions to try to resolve their differences. This settlement is the result of those discussions. The settlement consists of the following agreements by the Settling Parties:

1. The reasonable total costs recoverable from this CEMA application is \$23.44 million, consisting of \$15 million in capital costs and \$8.44 million in expenses. The revenue requirement resulting from these costs is \$14.94 million in electric revenue requirements, including interest through December 31, 2010, franchise fees, and uncollectibles, to be collected in rates with \$12.586 million collected in rates in 2009, and \$2.349 million in 2010<sup>1</sup> with any under or over collections of these amounts accruing to the associated balancing accounts. Upon approval of this settlement by the

---

<sup>1</sup> The revenue requirement numbers include interest calculated at the actual 90-day commercial paper rate through August 2008, and at the August 2008 90-day commercial paper rate thereafter on the unamortized balance through 2010. The numbers will change slightly over time as the forecasted 90-day commercial paper rate is replaced by the actual 90-day commercial paper rate in each month following August 2008.

Commission, PG&E will record commensurate amounts each year for the CEMA revenue requirement into the Distribution Revenue Adjustment Mechanism for rate recovery through its next available electric rate change in 2009 and through the Annual Electric True-up advice letter thereafter.

2. The Settling Parties agree that the Commission should find that it is reasonable for PG&E to recover \$14.94 million as PG&E's total authorized revenue requirement in this application. It is difficult to tie the final settlement amount to specific outcomes for individual issues; however, the final settlement amount does reflect litigation uncertainty assessed by one or both parties. This uncertainty includes, among other issues, the ability of either party to prove whether or not PG&E's requested costs were incremental.

### **III. RESERVATIONS**

1. The Settling Parties agree that this settlement represents a compromise of their respective litigation positions. It does not represent the Settling Parties' endorsement of, or agreement with, any or all of the recommendations made by the other party.

2. The Settling Parties shall by joint motion request Commission approval of this Settlement. The Settling Parties additionally agree to actively support prompt approval of the Settlement. Active support shall include necessary reply comments, comments on a proposed decision, written and oral testimony, if required, appearances, and other means to obtain the approvals sought. The Settling Parties further agree to participate jointly in necessary briefings to Commissioners and their advisors regarding the Settlement and the issues compromised and resolved by it.

3. This Settlement embodies the entire understanding and agreement of the Settling Parties with respect to the matters described herein, and, except as described herein, supersedes and cancels any and all prior oral or written agreements, principles, negotiations, statements, representations or understandings among the Settling Parties.

4. The Settlement may be amended or changed only by a written agreement signed by the Settling Parties.

5. The Settling Parties have bargained earnestly and in good faith to achieve this Settlement. The Settling Parties intend the Settlement to be interpreted and treated as a unified, interrelated agreement. The Settling Parties therefore agree that if the Commission fails to approve the Settlement as reasonable and adopt it unconditionally and without modification, including the findings and determinations requested herein, any Settling Party may in its sole discretion elect to terminate the Settlement. The Settling Parties further agree that any material change to the Settlement shall give each Settling Party in its sole discretion the option to terminate the Settlement. In the event the Settlement is terminated, the Settling Parties will request that the unresolved issues in Application 08-03-017 be heard at the earliest convenient time.

6. This Settlement represents a compromise of the Settling Parties' respective litigation positions and should not be considered precedent with respect to other CEMA costs, not at issue in this proceeding, for PG&E or other utilities in any future proceeding. The Settling Parties have assented to the terms of this Settlement Agreement only for the purpose of arriving at the various compromises herein. Except as provided in reservation #4, each Settling Party expressly reserves its right to advocate, in current and future proceedings, positions, principles, assumptions, arguments and methodologies that may be different from those underlying this Settlement.

7. Each of the Settling Parties hereto and their respective counsel have contributed to the preparation of this Settlement. Accordingly, the Settling Parties agree that no provision of this Settlement shall be construed against any Settling Party because that party or its counsel drafted the provision.

8. It is understood and agreed that no failure or delay by any Settling Party hereto in exercising any right, power or privilege hereunder shall operate as a waiver

hereof, nor shall any single or partial exercise thereof preclude any other or future exercise thereof or the exercise of any other right, power or privilege.

9. This document may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument.

10. This Settlement shall become effective among the Settling Parties on the date the last Settling Party executes the Settlement as indicated below.

In witness whereof, intending to be legally bound, the Settling Parties hereto have duly executed this Settlement Agreement on behalf of the parties they represent.

DIVISION OF RATEPAYER  
ADVOCATES

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
COMPANY

/S/

/S/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dana Appling  
Director  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dinyar Mistry  
Vice President  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Dated: September 17, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY HAND DELIVERY OR 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 Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Law Department, PO Box 7442, San Francisco, CA 94120.

On the 17<sup>th</sup> of September, 2008, I served a true copy of:

**JOINT MOTION OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND THE  
DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES FOR APPROVAL OF  
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

by hand delivery to the following:

Timothy Sullivan  
California Public Utilities Commission  
Division of Administrative Law Judges  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3214

Commissioner John Bohn  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3214

and

by electronic mail for all those on the official service list for A.08-03-017 who have provided 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 on the 17th day of September, 2008.

/S/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda Dannewitz

# THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SERVICE LIST

Downloaded September 17, 2008; Last updated on August 29, 2008

**Commissioner Assigned:** John Bohn on April 11, 2008

**ALJ Assigned:** Timothy J. Sullivan on April 11, 2008

## CPUC DOCKET NO. A0803017

Total number of addressees: 13

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

CASE ADMINISTRATION  
**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY**  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE, RM 370  
ROSEMEAD CA 91770  
Email: case.admin@sce.com  
Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT B. MCLENNAN  
**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.**  
LAW DEPARTMENT B30A  
PO BOX 7442, 77 BEALE ST, RM 313E  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
FOR: Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Email: rbm4@pge.com  
Status: PARTY

LARRY NIXON  
**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**  
77 BEALE ST., MCB9A  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
Email: ln3@pge.com  
Status: INFORMATION

ANDREW E. STEINBERG REGULATORY CASE  
MANAGER  
**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS CO.**  
555 W. FIFTH ST, GT14D6  
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1034  
Email: asteinberg@semprautilities.com  
Status: INFORMATION

PATRICIA R. THOMPSON  
**SUMMIT BLUE CONSULTING**  
2752 DOS RIOS DR.  
SAN RAMON CA 94583  
Email: Patricia.R.Thompson@gmail.com  
Status: INFORMATION

James R. Wuehler  
**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**  
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRANCH  
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4208  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214  
Email: jrw@cpuc.ca.gov  
Status: STATE-SERVICE

LAW DEPARTMENT FILE ROOM  
**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**  
PO BOX 7442  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120-7442  
Email: cpuccases@pge.com  
Status: INFORMATION

CASE COORDINATION  
**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**  
PO BOX 770000; MC B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177  
Email: regrelcpuccases@pge.com  
Status: INFORMATION

Ed Moldavsky  
**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**  
LEGAL DIVISION  
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5037  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214  
FOR: DRA  
Email: edm@cpuc.ca.gov  
Status: PARTY

KASIA SMOLEN  
**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**  
77 BEALE ST, MC B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
Email: kmsn@pge.com  
Status: INFORMATION

Timothy J. Sullivan  
**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**  
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES  
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 2106  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214  
Email: tjs@cpuc.ca.gov  
Status: STATE-SERVICE

Mark Waterworth  
**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**  
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRANCH  
770 L ST, STE 1050  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
Email: lmw@cpuc.ca.gov  
Status: STATE-SERVICE

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

Downloaded September 17, 2008, last updated on August 29, 2008

**Commissioner Assigned:** John Bohn on April 11, 2008

**ALJ Assigned:** Timothy J. Sullivan on April 11, 2008

**CPUC DOCKET NO. A0803017**

Application of PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY to Recover Costs Related to the January 2008 Storms Recorded in the Catastrophic Event Memorandum Account (CEMA) Pursuant to Public Utility Code Section 454.9. (U 39 E)	A.08-03-017
--	-------------

asteinberg@semprautilities.com;case.admin@sce.com;cem@newsdata.com;cpucases@pge.com;edm@cpuc.ca.gov;jrw@cpuc.ca.gov;kmsn@pge.com;lmw@cpuc.ca.gov;lrn3@pge.com;Patricia.R.Thompson@gmail.com;rbm4@pge.com;regrelcpucases@pge.com;tjs@cpuc.ca.gov;