BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

FILED
03-04-08
04:59 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement the Commission's Procurement Incentive Framework and to Examine the Integration of Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards into Procurement Policies.	Rulemaking 06-04-009 (Filed April 13, 2006)
Order Instituting Informational Proceeding – AB 32.	CEC Docket No. 07-OIIP-01

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POWER AUTHORITY REPLY COMMENT

Norman A. Pedersen, Esq.
HANNA AND MORTON LLP
444 South Flower Street, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, California 90071-2916
Telephone: (213) 430-2510
Facsimile: (213) 623-3379
E-mail: *npedersen@hanmor.com*

Attorney for the **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POWER AUTHORITY**

Dated: March 4, 2008

300226001nap03040801

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statutes i

Other Authorities i

I. AUCTION PROCEEDS ARE NOT "FEES" AUTHORIZED BY AB 32 1

II. SDG&E/SOCALGAS AND PG&E'S ADVOCACY FOR DISPARATE TREATMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRICITY SECTORS RESTS ON A FACTUAL ERROR. 3

III. THE ARGUMENT THAT NEW SUPPLY/SIDE MANDATES SHOULD NOT BE ADOPTED SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH A CAP-AND-TRADE PROGRAM FAILS TO RECOGNIZE THAT ADOPTION OF THE "DELIVERER" APPROACH REDUCES INTEREST IN EMISSION REDUCTIONS FOR RETAIL PROVIDERS THAT ARE NOT FULLY RESOURCED 4

IV. ARGUMENTS THAT ALLOWANCES SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO LOAD SERVING ENTITIES FOR SUBSEQUENT AUCTION ARE INAPPROPRIATE AND ERRONEOUS 5

V. CONCLUSION 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes

Cal. H & S Code § 38597 1
R.06-04-009 (Feb. 2, 2007) 4

Other Authorities

Assembly Daily Journal at 7646 (Aug. 31, 2006) 2

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POWER AUTHORITY
REPLY COMMENT

In accordance with Rule 14.3 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC"), the Southern California Public Power Authority ("SCPPA") respectfully submits this reply comment to address factual and legal errors in the February 28, 2008 opening comments of other parties regarding the Proposed Decision ("PD") mailed on February 8, 2008. This reply comment is being submitted simultaneously to both the CPUC and the California Energy Commission ("CEC") (jointly, "Commissions").

I. AUCTION PROCEEDS ARE NOT "FEES" AUTHORIZED BY AB 32.

The PD would require "deliverers" of electricity to participate in a multi-sector cap-and-trade market. As a result "deliverers" of electricity would be required to hold allowances to cover the emissions associated with the electricity that they deliver to the California grid. The PD concludes that "at least some portion of the allowances available to [deliverers] should be auctioned." PD at 85.

The prospect of allowances being auctioned raises a question about the legality of an auction and the collection of auction proceeds by the State. In their opening comment, San Diego Gas & Electric Company ("SDG&E") and Southern California Gas Company ("SoCalGas") contend that "auctioned revenues are legally a fee…." SDG&E/SoCalGas at 7. This implies that auctioning is authorized under Assembly Bill ("AB") 32. AB 32 specifically provides for the Air Resources Board ("ARB") to adopt "a schedule of *fees* to be paid by the sources of greenhouse gas emissions regulated pursuant to this division, consistent with Section 57001." Cal. H & S Code § 38597 (emphasis added).

However, the "fees" that ARB may impose under Cal. H & S Code § 38597 do not encompass auction proceeds. The ARB's "schedule of fees" must be "consistent with Section 57001…." Health & Safety Code § 57001 covers administrative fees, not auction proceeds. This was carefully explained in a letter submitted to the Assembly Daily Journal on August 31, 2006 by Speaker Nuñez. The Speaker explained: "AB 32 authorizes the California Air Resources Board to adopt a schedule of fees for the direct cost of administering the … programs established pursuant to the bill's provisions. It is my intent that any funds provided by Health and Safety Code Section 38597 (the part of AB 32 that authorizes the schedule of fees) be used solely for the direct costs incurred in administering this division." Assembly Daily Journal at

7646 (Aug. 31, 2006) (http://www.assembly.ca.gov/clerk/billslegislature/srchframe.htm). This interpretation of section 38597 was reiterated by the Director of the ARB Office of Climate Change, Chuck Schulock, at the ARB "mechanisms" workshop in Oakland, California, on January 16, 2008.

The reason that Speaker Nuñez in ARB carefully interpreted section 38597 to not include auction proceeds was to assure that AB 32 would not be seen as being a revenue generating statute. If AB 32 were a revenue generating statute, it would have been required to be approved by two-thirds vote of the Legislature. Article XIIIA of the California Constitution provides that "any changes in State taxes enacted for the purpose of increasing revenues … must be imposed by an Act passed by not less than two-thirds of all members elected to each of the two houses of the legislature." AB 32 was not passed by a two-thirds vote.

Insofar as auction revenues are *not* fees, the generation of auction revenue is not explicitly authorized by AB 32. SCPPA recommends that the Commissions reevaluate the legality of auctioning allowances as contemplated in the PD, given the narrow scope of section 38597.

Certainly, the generation of auction proceeds could be authorized by subsequent legislation. The PD recognizes that "additional legislative authority may be needed to achieve some of the objectives" of the PD. PD at 3. However, any legislation approving the auctioning of allowances would likely be interpreted as a measure enacted "for the purposes of increasing revenues" within Article XIIIA of the California Constitution, in which case a two-thirds vote of the Legislature would be required. As contemplated in the PD, "deliverers" as well as all other participants in the anticipated multi-sector cap-and-trade program would be required to acquire allowances. The Green Power Institute ("GPI") observes that the payments for allowances would be "a quasi carbon tax…." GPI at 3-4. To the extent to which the requirement that all cap-and-trade program participants hold allowances to cover their emissions, the imposition of an auction on them would be likely to be interpreted as the imposition of a revenue generating mechanism which would require a two-thirds vote of the Legislature.

II. SDG&E/SOCALGAS AND PG&E'S ADVOCACY FOR DISPARATE TREATMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRICITY SECTORS RESTS ON A FACTUAL ERROR.

Both SDG&E/SoCalGas and Pacific Gas & Electric Company ("PG&E") support including the electric sector in a multi-sector cap-and-trade system while excluding the natural

gas sector. SDG&E/SoCalGas at 2; PG&E at 2, 7. Their support for divergent treatment of the gas and electric sectors rests on the supposition that the sectors are different in how they would achieve GHG reductions. They assume: "First and foremost, there are significantly fewer options at this time to reduce GHG emissions in the natural gas sector." PD at 107.

The assumption that there are "fewer options" to reduce GHG emissions in the gas sector is a factually erroneous basis for treating the gas and electric sectors differently. Both sectors would attain GHG emission reductions by implementing energy efficiency measures and by relying more heavily on renewable resources. The combination of energy efficiency and renewable resources is just as available to the natural gas sector as the electric sector. The Natural Resources Defense Council ("NRDC") noted that just as energy efficiency and renewables will be the primary source of emission reductions in the electric sector, "energy efficiency, solar water and space heating, biomethane, and combined heat and power" will be available to the natural gas sector. NRDC at 3.

If the natural gas sector is not to be required to participate in the multi-sector cap-and-trade program as advocated by SDG&E/SoCalGas and PG&E, then there certainly should be an option for retail providers that are also deliverers of electricity to have an option to exclude emissions associated with their deliveries for service to native load from the multi-sector cap-and-trade program. Such an option would parallel permitting local distribution companies ("LDCs") to exclude the emissions associated with their deliveries of gas from the multi-sector cap-and-trade program. SCPPA and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power ("LADWP") proposed in their opening comments that electric sector retail providers that are also "deliverers" of electricity to serve native load should be permitted an option to exclude the emissions associated with those deliveries from operation of the cap-and-trade program.

SCPPA and LADWP also proposed that there be a cap on a retail provider's emissions associated with deliveries to service to native load, with the cap declining over time. If the natural gas sector is excluded from the cap-and-trade program as proposed by SDG&E/SoCalGas and by PG&E, then there should be a declining cap on an LDC's emissions associated with service to the LDC's native load similar to the cap that SCPPA and LADWP have proposed on emissions associated with deliveries that are dedicated to serve a retail provider's native load.

III. THE ARGUMENT THAT NEW SUPPLY/SIDE MANDATES SHOULD NOT BE ADOPTED SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH A CAP-AND-TRADE PROGRAM FAILS TO RECOGNIZE THAT ADOPTION OF THE "DELIVERER"

APPROACH REDUCES INTEREST IN EMISSION REDUCTIONS FOR RETAIL PROVIDERS THAT ARE NOT FULLY RESOURCED.

SDG&E/SoCalGas argue that "new supply-side mandates should not be simultaneously adopted with the cap-and-trade program." SDG&E/SoCalGas at 4. Particularly, SDG&E/SoCalGas argue that the Commissions "should not recommend to ARB that it is necessary to adopt new state mandated RPS levels." *Ibid* at 5. It seems that the Division of Ratepayer Advocates ("DRA") agrees. DRA contends that "more restrictive regulatory mandates could result in fewer benefits from the inclusion of the electricity sector in the California cap-and-trade program." DRA at 4.

It may be true that additional RPS requirements or energy efficiency requirements are not necessary for retail providers that are fully-resourced and which, as a consequence, would be "deliverers" for all or most of the electricity that they provide to their customers. To the extent to which retail providers are also "deliverers," they would be required to acquire allowances to cover their emissions and, accordingly, would have an incentive to reduce emissions to reduce the cost of allowances.

The southern California publicly-owned utilities ("POUs") that are members of SCPPA tend to be fully resourced. Thus, for them, it may be unnecessary to impose both programmatic mandates and a requirement that they participate in the cap-and-trade program. However, California investor-owned utilities ("IOUs") are *not* fully resourced. As a legacy of AB 1890 and "deregulation" of the California electricity market, a much more substantial portion of the electricity that IOUs provide to their native load is acquired through the wholesale market.

Under the PD, the IOUs would not be required to participate in the cap-and-trade program to acquire allowances to cover the emissions associated with the portion of electricity they acquire through wholesale transactions in California. Insofar as the IOUs would be "deliverers" of electricity for a much smaller percentage of electricity that they serve to their native load in comparison to POUs, IOUs will have a diminished incentive to implement energy efficiency and renewable resource programs. CPUC President Peevey observed: "If we were to take a source-based approach and apply emissions caps only to generators, then it would be much more difficult to integrate energy efficiency and renewables policies into our overall climate strategy." Scoping Memo at 9, R.06-04-009 (Feb. 2, 2007). For the IOUs that tend to be far less than fully-resourced, it is necessary to have robust programmatic mandates as envisioned

in the PD, although the programmatic mandates would be far less necessary for the POUs that may be included in the PD's cap-and-trade program.

IV. ARGUMENTS THAT ALLOWANCES SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO LOAD SERVING ENTITIES FOR SUBSEQUENT AUCTION ARE INAPPROPRIATE AND ERRONEOUS.

SDG&E/SoCalGas contend that the PD should be modified to provide that if there is an auction, there should be a "allocation to LSEs, with a subsequent non-discriminatory auction by or on behalf of LSEs of all allowances to first deliverers." SDG&E/SoCalGas at 6. PG&E supports the same methodology, although PG&E does not advocate revising the PD.

The SDG&E/SoCalGas proposal for modification of the PD to provide for an administrative allocation of allowances to load-serving entities ("LSEs") with a subsequent auction to "deliverers" that, under the PD, would be required to participate in a cap-and-trade program is entirely inappropriate. The proposal descends to a level of detail about auctioning allowances that is not reached in the PD. Moreover, the proposal is substantively unfair and, as such, should be categorically rejected. The underlying assumption is that there would be an administrative allocation of allowances to LSEs on a basis of their retail sales or "output." If the LSEs were then to resell the allowances to the "deliverers" that would be required to participate in the cap-and-trade program and hold allowances as envisioned in the PD, there would be a massive transfer of wealth from retail providers that have a relatively low carbon intensity such as PG&E to retail providers that are also "deliverers" which currently have a higher carbon intensity such as the SCPPA members. *See* SCPPA Supplement to Opening Comment and Reply Comment on Allowance Allocation Issues at 4-6 (November 14, 2007).

V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth herein and in SCPPA's February 28, 2008 opening comment, SCPPA recommends that the PD be revised as SCPPA proposed in its opening comment.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Norman A. Pedersen

Norman A. Pedersen, Esq.

Attorney for the **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POWER AUTHORITY**

Dated: March 4, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POWER AUTHORITY REPLY COMMENT** on the service list for CPUC Docket No. R.06-04-009 and CEC Docket No. 07-OIIP-01 by serving a copy to each party by electronic mail and/or by mailing a properly addressed copy by first-class mail with postage prepaid.

Executed on March 4, 2008, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Sylvia Cantos

Sylvia Cantos

R.06-04-009 SERVICE LIST
DOCKET 07-OIIP-01 SERVICE LIST

abb@eslawfirm.com
abonds@thelen.com
achang@nrdc.org
adamb@greenlining.org
aeg@cpuc.ca.gov
agc@cpuc.ca.gov
agrimaldi@mckennalong.com
ahendrickson@commerceenergy.com
aimee.barnes@ecosecurities.com
ajkatz@mwe.com
akbar.jazayeri@sce.com
akelly@climatetrust.org
alan.comnes@nrgenergy.com
aldyn.hoekstra@paceglobal.com
alex.kang@itron.com
alho@pge.com
amber@ethree.com
andrew.bradford@constellation.com
andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org
andy.vanhorn@vhcenergy.com
anita.hart@swgas.com
annabelle.malins@fco.gov.uk
apak@sempraglobal.com
arno@recurrentenergy.com
atrial@sempra.com
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com
Audra.Hartmann@Dynegy.com
aweller@sel.com
ayk@cpuc.ca.gov
bbaker@summitblue.com
bbc@cpuc.ca.gov
bbeebe@smud.org
bblevins@energy.state.ca.us
bcragg@goodinmacbride.com
bdicapo@caiso.com
bernardo@braunlegal.com
beth@beth411.com
Betty.Seto@kema.com
bill.chen@constellation.com
bill.schrand@swgas.com
bjeider@ci.burbank.ca.us
bjl@bry.com
bjones@mjbradley.com
bkc7@pge.com
blm@cpuc.ca.gov
bmcc@mccarthylaw.com
bmcquown@reliant.com
Bob.lucas@calobby.com
bpotts@foley.com
bpurewal@water.ca.gov
brabe@umich.edu
brbarkovich@earthlink.net
brbc@pge.com
brenda.lemay@horizonwind.com
burtraw@rff.org
bushinskyj@pewclimate.org
bwallerstein@aqmd.gov
bwetstone@hotmail.com
C_Marnay@lbl.gov
cadams@covantaenergy.com
californiadockets@pacificorp.com
carla.peterman@gmail.com
carter@ieta.org
case.admin@sce.com
cathy.karlstad@sce.com
cbaskette@enernoc.com
cbreidenich@yahoo.com
cchen@ucsusa.org
cem@newsdata.com
cf1@cpuc.ca.gov
cft@cpuc.ca.gov
charlie.blair@delta-ee.com
chilen@sppc.com
cjw5@pge.com
ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net
ckrupka@mwe.com
clarence.binninger@doj.ca.gov
clark.bernier@rlw.com
clyde.murley@comcast.net
cmkehrein@ems-ca.com
colin.petheram@att.com
cpe@cpuc.ca.gov
cpechman@powereconomics.com
cswoollums@midamerican.com
curt.barry@iwpnews.com
curtis.kebler@gs.com
cweddington@commerceenergy.com
Cynthia.A.Fonner@constellation.com
cynthia.schultz@pacificorp.com
daking@sempra.com
Dan.adler@calcef.org
danskopec@gmail.com

dansvec@hdo.net
dave@ppallc.com
david.zonana@doj.ca.gov
david@branchcomb.com
david@nemtzow.com
davidreynolds@ncpa.com
dbrooks@nevp.com
deborah.slon@doj.ca.gov
dehling@klng.com
derek@climateregistry.org
dhecht@sempratrading.com
dhuard@manatt.com
Diane_Fellman@fpl.com
dietrichlaw2@earthlink.net
dil@cpuc.ca.gov
dkk@eslawfirm.com
dks@cpuc.ca.gov
dmacmull@water.ca.gov
dmetz@energy.state.ca.us
dniehaus@semprautilities.com
douglass@energyattorney.com
dseperas@calpine.com
dsh@cpuc.ca.gov
dsoyars@sppc.com
dtibbs@aes4u.com
dwang@nrdc.org
dwood8@cox.net
dws@r-c-s-inc.com
echiang@elementmarkets.com
edm@cpuc.ca.gov
edwardoneill@dwt.com
egw@a-klaw.com
ehadley@reupower.com
ej_wright@oxy.com
ek@a-klaw.com
ekgrubaugh@iid.com
eks@cpuc.ca.gov
ELL5@pge.com
elvine@lbl.gov
emahlon@ecoact.org
emello@sppc.com
epoole@adplaw.com
e-recipient@caiso.com
etiedemann@kmtg.com
ewolfe@resero.com
ez@pointcarbon.com
farrokh.albuyeh@oati.net
fiji.george@elpaso.com
filings@a-klaw.com
fjs@cpuc.ca.gov
fstern@summitblue.com
fwmonier@tid.org
gbarch@knowledgeinenergy.com
gblue@enxco.com
gcollord@arb.ca.gov
george.hopley@barcap.com
ghinners@reliant.com
GloriaB@anzaelectric.org
glw@eslawfirm.com
gmorris@emf.net
gpickering@navigantconsulting.com
gregory.koiser@constellation.com
grosenblum@caiso.com
gsmith@adamsbroadwell.com
GXL2@pge.com
harveyederpspc.org@hotmail.com
hayley@turn.org
hcronin@water.ca.gov
hgolub@nixonpeabody.com
hoerner@redefiningprogress.org
hurlock@water.ca.gov
HYao@SempraUtilities.com
hym@cpuc.ca.gov
info@calseia.org
Jairam.gopal@sce.com
james.keating@bp.com
janill.richards@doj.ca.gov
jarmstrong@goodinmacbride.com
jason.dubchak@niskags.com
jbf@cpuc.ca.gov
jbw@slwplc.com
jchamberlin@strategicenergy.com
jci@cpuc.ca.gov
JDF1@PGE.COM
jdh@eslawfirm.com
jdoll@arb.ca.gov
jeanne.sole@sfgov.org
jeffgray@dwt.com
jen@cnt.org
jenine.schenk@apses.com
jennifer.porter@energycenter.org
JerryL@abag.ca.gov
jesus.arredondo@nrgenergy.com
jf2@cpuc.ca.gov
jgill@caiso.com
jgreco@terra-genpower.com
jhahn@covantaenergy.com
jholtkamp@hollandhart.com
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com
jj.prucnal@swgas.com

jjensen@kirkwood.com
jk1@cpuc.ca.gov
jkarp@winston.com
jkloberdanz@semprautilities.com
jlaun@apogee.net
jleslie@luce.com
jluckhardt@downeybrand.com
jm3@cpuc.ca.gov
jnm@cpuc.ca.gov
jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net
Joe.paul@dynegy.com
john.hughes@sce.com
johnrredding@earthlink.net
jol@cpuc.ca.gov
josephhenri@hotmail.com
joyw@mid.org
jsanders@caiso.com
jscancarelli@flk.com
jsqueri@gmssr.com
jst@cpuc.ca.gov
jtp@cpuc.ca.gov
julie.martin@bp.com
jwiedman@goodinmacbride.com
jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com
jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com
jxa2@pge.com
karen@klindh.com
karla.dailey@cityofpaloalto.org
Kathryn.Wig@nrgenergy.com
kbowen@winston.com
kcolburn@symbioticstrategies.com
kdusel@navigantconsulting.com
kdw@woodruff-expert-services.com
keith.mccrea@sablaw.com
kellie.smith@sen.ca.gov
kelly.barr@srpnet.com
ken.alex@doj.ca.gov
ken.alex@doj.ca.gov
kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.com
kerry.hattevik@mirant.com
kevin.boudreaux@calpine.com
kfox@wsgr.com
kgough@calpine.com
kgrenfell@nrdc.org
kgriffin@energy.state.ca.us
kjinnovation@earthlink.net
kjsimonsen@ems-ca.com
kkhoja@thelenreid.com
klatt@energyattorney.com
kmills@cfbf.com
kmkiener@fox.net
kowalewskia@calpine.com
krd@cpuc.ca.gov
kyle.l.davis@pacificorp.com
kyle.silon@ecosecurities.com
kyle_boudreaux@fpl.com
lars@resource-solutions.org
Laura.Genao@sce.com
lcottle@winston.com
ldecarlo@energy.state.ca.us
leilani.johnson@ladwp.com
liddell@energyattorney.com
lisa.c.schwartz@state.or.us
lisa_weinzimer@platts.com
llorenz@semprautilities.com
llund@commerceenergy.com
lmh@eslawfirm.com
Lorraine.Paskett@ladwp.com
lpark@navigantconsulting.com
lrdevanna-rf@cleanenergysystems.com
lrm@cpuc.ca.gov
lschavrien@semprautilities.com
ltenhope@energy.state.ca.us
ltt@cpuc.ca.gov
marcel@turn.org
marcie.milner@shell.com
mary.lynch@constellation.com
mclaughlin@braunlegal.com
mday@goodinmacbride.com
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
mflorio@turn.org
mgarcia@arb.ca.gov
mgillette@enernoc.com
mhyams@sfwater.org
Mike@alpinenaturalgas.com
mjd@cpuc.ca.gov
mmattes@nossaman.com
mmazur@3phasesRenewables.com
mona@landsiteinc.net
monica.schwebs@bingham.com
mpa@a-klaw.com
mpryor@energy.state.ca.us
mrw@mrwassoc.com
mscheibl@arb.ca.gov
mwaugh@arb.ca.gov
nenbar@energy-insights.com
ner@cpuc.ca.gov
nes@a-klaw.com
nlenssen@energy-insights.com
norman.furuta@navy.mil

notice@psrec.coop
npedersen@hanmor.com
nsuetake@turn.org
ntronaas@energy.state.ca.us
nwhang@manatt.com
obartho@smud.org
obystrom@cera.com
ofoote@hkcf-law.com
pbarthol@energy.state.ca.us
pburmich@arb.ca.gov
pduvair@energy.state.ca.us
pepper@cleanpowermarkets.com
phanschen@mofo.com
Philip.H.Carver@state.or.us
philm@scdenergy.com
pjazayeri@stroock.com
ppettingill@caiso.com
psp@cpuc.ca.gov
pssed@adelphia.net
pstoner@lgc.org
pthompson@summitblue.com
pvallen@thelen.com
pw1@cpuc.ca.gov
pzs@cpuc.ca.gov
rachel@ceert.org
ralph.dennis@constellation.com
ram@cpuc.ca.gov
randy.howard@ladwp.com
randy.sable@swgas.com
rapcowart@aol.com
ray.welch@navigantconsulting.com
rhelgeson@scppa.org
RHHJ@pge.com
rhwiser@lbl.gov
richards@mid.org
rick_noger@praxair.com
rita@ritanortonconsulting.com
rkeen@manatt.com
rkmoore@gswater.com
rmccann@umich.edu
rmiller@energy.state.ca.us
rmm@cpuc.ca.gov
rmorillo@ci.burbank.ca.us
robert.pettinato@ladwp.com
Robert.Rozanski@ladwp.com
roger.montgomery@swgas.com
rogerv@mid.org
ron.deaton@ladwp.com
rprince@semprautilities.com
rreinhard@mofo.com
rrtaylor@srpnet.com
rsa@a-klaw.com
rschmidt@bartlewells.com
rsmutny-jones@caiso.com
rwinthrop@pilotpowergroup.com
ryan.flynn@pacificorp.com
S1L7@pge.com
saeed.farrokhpay@ferc.gov
samuel.r.sadler@state.or.us
sandra.carolina@swgas.com
Sandra.ely@state.nm.us
sas@a-klaw.com
sasteriadis@apx.com
sbeatty@cwclaw.com
sberlin@mccarthylaw.com
sbeserra@sbcglobal.net
scarter@nrdc.org
scohn@smud.org
scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com
scottanders@sandiego.edu
scr@cpuc.ca.gov
sdhilton@stoel.com
SEHC@pge.com
sellis@fypower.org
sendo@ci.pasadena.ca.us
sephra.ninow@energycenter.org
sgm@cpuc.ca.gov
slins@ci.glendale.ca.us
sls@a-klaw.com
smichel@westernresources.org
smindel@knowledgeinenergy.com
smk@cpuc.ca.gov
snewsom@semprautilities.com
spauker@wsgr.com
sscb@pge.com
ssmyers@att.net
steve.koerner@elpaso.com
steve@schiller.com
stevek@kromer.com
steven.huhman@morganstanley.com
steven.schleimer@barclayscapital.com
steven@iepa.com
steven@lipmanconsulting.com
steven@moss.net
svn@cpuc.ca.gov
svongdeuane@semprasolutions.com
svs6@pge.com
tam@cpuc.ca.gov
tburke@sfwater.org
tcarlson@reliant.com

tcx@cpuc.ca.gov
tdarton@pilotpowergroup.com
tdillard@sppc.com
THAMILTON5@CHARTER.NET
thunt@cecmail.org
tiffany.rau@bp.com
tim.hemig@nrgenergy.com
todil@mckennalong.com
Tom.Elgie@powerex.com
tomb@crossborderenergy.com
tomk@mid.org
trdill@westernhubs.com
troberts@sempra.com
UHelman@caiso.com
vb@pointcarbon.com
vitaly.lee@aes.com
vjw3@pge.com
vprabhakaran@goodinmacbride.com
vwelch@environmentaldefense.org
wbooth@booth-law.com
westgas@aol.com
william.tomlinson@elpaso.com
wsm@cpuc.ca.gov
wtasat@arb.ca.gov
www@eslawfirm.com
wynne@braunlegal.com
ygross@sempraglobal.com
zaiontj@bp.com